LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 18 1963
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BS2341
.K89
v.1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/clarifiednewtest01krae

THE
CLARIFIED
NEW
TESTAMENT

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 18 1963
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Emil G. Kraeling

THE CLARIFIED NEW TESTAMENT

VOLUME I

THE FOUR GOSPELS

McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
NEW YORK TORONTO LONDON

THE CLARIFIED NEW TESTAMENT

VOLUME I, THE FOUR GOSPELS

Copyright © 1962 by Emil G. Kraeling. Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. This book or parts thereof may not be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publishers.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-17887

First Edition

35352

To my brother Carl
at three score and five.
Formerly Director of the
Oriental Institute of
the University of Chicago.

Preface

The present work is intended to provide students in colleges as well as others who wish to read the New Testament literature in the light of modern knowledge with a tool that will simplify and expedite their task. The method is one of reproducing and at the same time clarifying the contents of these writings. One might call it an interpretative analysis. At times it is a paraphrase, and sometimes it approaches a literal translation. However, in the case of the Gospels higher-critical, form-critical, historical, comparative-religious, and other matters clamored for attention and prevented exclusive adherence to the paraphrase procedure. The aim is not to modernize, but to convey something of the true ancient flavor of the writings dealt with, on the basis of the Greek, not of any translation. The emphasis is on the rational side: understanding what the text means, without burdening the reader unduly with matters of supplementary knowledge such as of geography and archaeology, with which I have dealt extensively in my *Rand McNally Bible Atlas,* or for which Bible dictionaries furnish information conveniently.

For practical reasons, to make more clear the interrelationship of the first three Gospels and to ease the work of students, I have adopted the division of materials as given in the widely used Greek *Synopsis* of Huck and in its reproduction in English by Throckmorton. The same synoptic outline in identical headings has been applied to each Gospel separately, instead of creating individualized outlines with divergent divisions of the material based on what one conceives to be—though it is ever debatable—the purpose of a Gospel author. The overriding aim is to permit ready comparison of the corresponding materials. Mark, as the oldest Gospel, has been put first—even in the Table of the Parallel Gospels on p. 24 ff. In the case of Matthew and Luke the units parallel to Mark have not been dealt with elaborately a second and third time; my comments have been confined rather to pointing out the more noticeable differences in presentation. The same thing is true in the case of Luke, in what he has in common with Matthew.

Whether the reader is provided with a Synopsis or not, he will find it a great convenience to have at hand separate booklets of the first three Gospels, such as those in 4½- x 3-inch size with R.S.V. text and numbered RS 530, which are obtainable from the American Bible Society.

Some may question the usefulness of calling attention frequently to divergences in the readings of important manuscripts or versions. The purpose here is to make the reader aware of the fact that we do not always stand on firm ground and that the recovery of the original text remains an important task of the future. The section on the text of the New Testament will give him some elementary insight into this great and arduous department of New Testament research. Others will find the quoting of Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic words superfluous; if so, they need pay no attention to them—these words are given in the interest of precision and for the benefit of the student acquiring such languages. For some minor technical matters the reader's attention is called to the list of abbreviations given below.

A second volume dealing with the rest of the New Testament is in preparation. It is with an eye to the entire work that the preliminary sections on the canon and text of the New Testament have been put at the head of this book. The work is not intended to replace the full commentary. Like the Bible translator, the author cannot stop to argue over interpretations, but must make his choice of them. But this work can serve as an introduction and encouragement to commentary study for those who desire to go more deeply into it, while fulfilling the needs of those who wish only the amount of guidance here offered.

E. G. K.

ABBREVIATIONS

Biblical books are abbreviated as in the Revised Standard Version.
For pseudepigraphic writings see under "Charles" in the Bibliography.

Eus. = Eusebius. See Bibliography.
Jos. = Josephus. See Bibliography.

Aram. = Aramaic
Gr. = Greek
Heb. = Hebrew
LXX = The Septuagint Greek translation
MT = Masoretic text

The occasionally used symbol > means "derived from"; < "leading to."

Considerable use has been made of parentheses. The matter enclosed in them is of the following kinds:

1. Supplementary words, phrases, or clauses that may be read as though they were part of the restated New Testament text.
2. Sentences supplying a connecting thought.
3. An explanatory comment on something at the point where it applies, even though within a sentence.
4. References to biblical passages or to other authorities. Sometimes these have material relevance and sometimes they are given only for philological reasons—to vindicate an interpretation of a word or to call attention to use elsewhere of the same Greek word presupposed.

Contents

Preface vii

Origin and History of the New Testament Canon 1

The Text of the New Testament 6

Introduction to the Gospels 13

Table of the Parallel Gospels 24

The Gospel according to Mark 33

The Gospel according to Matthew 115

The Gospel according to Luke 191

The Gospel according to John 263

Selected Bibliography 333

Origin and History of the New Testament Canon

Covenant and Testament

The second and shorter portion of the Church's Bible is a collection of Greek writings to which the ancient churchmen gave the title "the New Covenant" (Gr. *hē kainḗ diathḗkē*). This designation, which appears on the scene with Clement of Alexandria (*c.* A.D. 200), was no doubt based on such passages as Gal. 4:24, Jer. 31:31, and the Covenant allusion in the accounts of the Lord's Supper. The translation of the Greek title into the Latin *novum testamentum,* which is first found in the writings of Tertullian (*c.* 200), and which led, via the Latin Bible translation, to our English designation "the New Testament," brought with it a modification in meaning. Whereas "the New Covenant" was short for "Books of the New Covenant"—i.e., the covenant which God made with men through Jesus Christ, as distinct from that which he made with Israel of old—the phrase "the New Testament" conveyed the idea of a new authoritative document setting forth God's will, much as a testament sets forth a man's last will.

The Situation Prior to Canonization

"Canon" (Gr. for "rule") as generally understood is an authoritative body of writings. "Canonization" is the act of setting up such a corpus. It does not have finality until a particular act ceases to be challenged. Hence some Protestant theologians have held that the Canon as we have it today is not unalterable.

The need to set up an authoritative collection of Christian writings did not arise until the middle of the second century. Before that time, the Greek-speaking Church relied for its Holy Writ on the Scriptures of the Jews in the Greek Septuagint translation, or LXX. They were read with Christian eyes, as prophetic of Jesus Christ (cf. Lk. 24:27). In addition, there were Christian Gospels providing information about the Lord's life and teachings, and there were epistles or letters of Christian leaders, notably of Paul, dealing with teaching and exhortation. Such writings, we must suppose, were handed about from one congregation to another. Originally each area must have had a single Gospel that enjoyed the sponsorship of its churchmen. But Christian readers no doubt were eager to hear more about Jesus and were receptive to the idea of using Gospels prized in other quarters. The four that were destined to become canonical were already known and used by Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 150). He speaks of them as "the memoirs (Gr. *apomnēmoneúmata*) of the Apostles which are called Gospels," thus putting them in a literary category known to educated Greeks, but not suiting our modern idea of these writings. They were not yet Holy Scripture; only the Jewish sacred writings enjoyed that status.

Marcion's Canon; Tatian's Harmony

Strange to say, the first New Testament was set up by a man whom the Church as such was to condemn—Marcion, who had come to Rome from Pontus on the Black Sea *c.* A.D. 140. He had no use for the Jewish Scriptures, and desired to replace them with distinctively Christian Scriptures. He was deeply impressed with Paul's battle to keep Christianity from being Judaized. He accepted one of the Gospels current in the churches, that of Luke, because its traditional author had been a helper of Paul. He asserted, however, that the text of the Gospel had received additions by the "protectors of Judaism," corrupting its original purity, and so made deletions to restore it to its pristine form. He also accepted ten similarly purified letters of Paul, in the following order: Galatians (the epistle that had opened his eyes to the Judaizing peril), 1–2 Corinthians, Romans, 1–2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans (= Ephesians?), Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. The Muratorian fragment (cf. below) also mentions a letter to the Alexandrians "forged in Paul's name for the heresy of Marcion," presumably then a later addition to his Canon.

The movement founded by Marcion had a tremendous success; within a few years it had become widespread. The Church in opposing it was driven to imitate him and to set up its own collection of sacred books. It was not yet, however, the complete collection as we know it. Instead of one Gospel, it set up "The Gospel according to the Four," i.e., the four evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Epistles of Paul. It presented what was claimed to be the unaltered text, over against Marcion's edited text.

Another important second-century personage was the Syrian Tatian, who, likewise at Rome, set up a Gospel Harmony compiled from these four Gospels (*c.* A.D. 172). It was known as the Diatessaron ("through four"), and gained a considerable influence in the East, especially in its Syriac translation, which became the authoritative Gospel-book of the Church in the North Syrian-Mesopotamian area, and held that position until the beginning of the fifth century. A fragment of the Greek Diatessaron, dating from *c.* A.D. 222 was found in the excavations at Dura in Mesopotamia and published in 1935 by Carl H. Kraeling. Apart from that our knowledge of the Diatessaron rests on Arabic, Armenian, Latin, and Dutch versions.

The Emergence of the Church's Canon

While the existence of most writings now found in our New Testament can be traced from quotations in second-century Christian writers, such quotations are not always indicative of canonical status; other writings that did not become part of our New Testament are also quoted with apparently just as much authority. Besides Justin Martyr and Tatian, one may mention Melito of Sardis, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch as important sources of information. But they recede into the background in the face of such a witness as the fragment found in the

Ambrosiana at Milan by a man named L. A. Muratori and published by him in 1740. This Canon Muratori purports to give a list of the Christian authoritative books. As it is in Latin and was found in Italy, it no doubt gives us the Canon of the Church of Rome as of its time. It dates from *c.* A.D. 200, for the author in rejecting a popular religious book called the Shepherd of Hermas states that the latter is a recent work, written by the brother of the Roman bishop Pius I (140–155). Although broken off at the beginning, the Muratorian document evidently had the four Gospels in the familiar order, and it has the Acts of the Apostles, which was not included when the Anti-Marcion Canon was first set up, in its present position after the Gospels. The Epistles of Paul then follow Acts in this order: 1–2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans, Philemon, Titus, 1–2 Timothy. Next come the Epistle of Jude and two Epistles of John. Then follow the Wisdom of Solomon, the Revelation of John, and the Apocalypse of Peter (the latter with a qualification). The inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon is odd because this work is now among the Old Testament Apocrypha, but is a tribute to its influence at that time. It is significant that the Epistles of Peter are missing in a canonical list coming from the area where Peter was most esteemed, and that the one to the Hebrews and that of James are not included, though both were known and used in Rome a century earlier. It is of less significance that one of the three Epistles of John, no doubt the third, is missing.

The Canon of Irenaeus (*c.* 200), bishop of Lyons in Gaul, but a native of Asia Minor, seems to have included the four Gospels, thirteen Epistles of Paul (hence excluding Hebrews), 1–2 John, Acts, and Revelation (possibly also Jude and 3 John). He once quotes the Shepherd of Hermas as Holy Scripture. Tertullian (*c.* 200) shows that in his area (North Africa) the four Gospels, thirteen Epistles of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, Jude, Acts (note its position) and Revelation were Holy Scripture; for a time, he also included Hermas. Clement of Alexandria (also *c.* 200) is less definite in circumscribing the Christian sacred books. He uses other Gospels besides the four, and he has fourteen Epistles of Paul (thus including Hebrews), 1 Peter, 1–2 John, Jude (possibly also James, 3 John, and 2 Peter), Acts and Revelation. In addition, he includes the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, 1 Clement, the Teaching of the Apostles (Gr. *Didachē,* teaching, a work rediscovered in Constantinople and published in 1883), and Hermas.

Origen and Eusebius

One of Clement of Alexandria's pupils was Origen (*c.* 230), the greatest biblical scholar of the early Church. A much-traveled man, he noted that there was considerable diversity of opinion in the churches with regard to the authority of certain writings. He differentiates between two classes of books: the generally recognized ones (*homologóumena*) and the doubtful ones (*amphiballómena*). To the former class he reckons the four Gospels, thirteen Epistles of Paul, 1 Peter, 1 John, Acts, and Revelation. In the doubtful class he puts Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2–3 John, James, Jude, Barnabas, Didache, Hermas, and the Gospel of the Hebrews (a work of which only fragments have come down in quotations of the Church Fathers). The

Alexandrians, however, soon developed a distaste for Revelation, and so it was dropped from their sacred books. This affected its status almost everywhere in the East.

At the beginning of the fourth century, Eusebius of Caesarea gives us a report of the situation concerning the Canon (*Eccl. Hist., 3,* 26). Like Origen, he differentiates between accepted and disputed books. The former he also calls *hómologóumena.* They include the four Gospels, fourteen Pauline Epistles, 1 John, 1 Peter, Acts, and somewhat doubtfully, Revelation. The other group he calls books which are disputed (*antilegómena*). Actually there is a further differentiation within this group between books that while disputed do enjoy a good deal of recognition and another group of clearly nonauthentic books. In the class of the more acceptable although disputed books he puts James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2–3 John. The less acceptable group includes the Acts of Paul, Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Didache and, rather inconsistently, the Revelation of John (previously mentioned in the first group). In addition, he knows books that stand totally outside consideration, such as certain heretical Gospels and Acts of the various Apostles. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, he notes, enjoyed much favor among Jewish Christians. But he rules out completely books brought forward by the heretics, such as the Gospels of Peter, Thomas (recently rediscovered, see p. 23), Matthias, "and some others," as well as the Acts of Andrew, John, and other Apostles. No orthodox teacher of the Church, he declares, has so much as mentioned any of these in his writings. It should be borne in mind that apart from the strictures on the heretical books, Eusebius is giving the position of the churches, and not his own opinion of what should be considered canonical. Elsewhere, he reports adversely on the authenticity of some of the books he puts in the accepted class.

The Decisive Actions

The year 367 is an important one in the history of the New Testament Canon. For in that year the Patriarch Athanasius of Alexandria wrote his 39th Festal Letter, in which he informed the bishops of Egypt concerning the books that were to be regarded as canonical Scripture. He mentions all twenty-seven books of the New Testament as we have it, and these only. Of the numerous other books once in use, he will admit only two for employment in catechetical instruction: the Didache and Hermas. He treats all twenty-seven writings as of equal rank. This Canon of Athanasius found widespread acceptance in the East, though there was opposition to Revelation in many areas until the eighth century. The firm support given this book in the West eventually prevailed.

Revelation, the so-called "Catholic" or General Epistles (1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, James, and Jude), and the Epistle to the Hebrews were the problem children in the canonical development. Although Hebrews was apparently known in the West before the end of the first century, there was a reluctance in that quarter as late as the first half of the fourth century to admit it to canonical rank. In the East, on the other hand, especially in Egypt, Hebrews was highly esteemed and accepted as a fourteenth letter of Paul. In the period when the Orthodox churches of both

East and West collaborated in fighting Arianism (the doctrine of the Presbyter Arius of Alexandria, which was condemned at the Council of Nicaea in 325), mutual concessions were made: the East gave up its opposition to Revelation; and the West, its opposition to Hebrews. As for the Catholic Epistles, they were fixed as a group of seven by the Roman Pope Damasus in his Synod of 382. The African Church at the Synods of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397) accepted this New Testament Canon of twenty-seven books. In the East, however, the Syriac-speaking Church never accepted Revelation, and only three of the seven Catholic Epistles: 1 Peter, 1 John, and James.

The Complete New Testament

Though it is a work that has grown together in a discernible process, the New Testament now stands before us as a whole. It is, indeed, a remarkable collection. Quite properly the four books we call Gospels are at the head, with their report of the ministry of Jesus, but written to set forth the Christian message. Then follows Acts with the story of the spread of Christianity from East to West in the Apostolic Age, with emphasis on the authority of the Twelve Apostles and on the mighty labors of the missionary Paul. Next come the powerful Pauline Epistles, leading source of Christian theological thinking, supplemented by the Epistle to the Hebrews—the cleat fastening the Old Testament to the New. This group is succeeded (in some ancient manuscripts, preceded) by the Catholic, or General Epistles, representing the supposed witness of two of the Twelve Apostles, Peter and John, and two of the Lord's brethren, James and Jude. The end is reached with the colorful book of Revelation. The rich variety of thought and subject matter contained in this New Testament, a work of some 225,000 words, exceeds that of any other collection made by man. It staggers the imagination to think of the influence on human life that has gone forth from it. It continues to instruct, chastise, comfort, and inspire. Its study is worthy of effort.

The Text of the New Testament

The Language

Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century firmly believed that the New Testament was written in the very best Greek, for since it was supposedly dictated by the Holy Ghost it had to be perfect in this respect, too. Increasing knowledge of the Graeco-Roman civilization developed by eighteenth-century study rendered such a position untenable. Thus emerged the view that the New Testament writers employed a Semitized Greek, influenced by their mother tongue. Only after Egypt began to yield discoveries of Greek papyri in the nineteenth century was it made fully clear, notably through the work of Adolf Deissmann (since 1895), that the New Testament was written in the Greek that was spoken in the whole eastern part of the Roman empire in the first century A.D., the so-called Koine (short for *hē koinē-diálektos*), "the common speech." If some secular authors like Polybius and Plutarch were strongly influenced by the Koine, the New Testament falls under the Koine classification throughout. There are, however, diverse levels in the Koine of the New Testament. The best Greek found in it is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author of Luke-Acts also, where not bound by earlier source material, can express himself in good Hellenistic Greek. The author of Revelation, on the other hand, wrote a barbarous Greek, even by Koine standards.

All the New Testament writers were helped by the availability of the LXX, a product of the Koine at an earlier stage, the third century B.C. In it many religious concepts of the Hebrew Old Testament were given Greek interpretation, often with considerable modification of meaning. The New Testament authors were thus not compelled to create a new terminology in all respects. The way had been excellently prepared for them by this first of all Bible translations. Indeed, the propaganda success of the Christian missionaries in the Hellenistic world is almost unthinkable without the existence of this work, which Jews had spread abroad and to which Christians could appeal for proofs for their own claim that Jesus was the Messiah whose coming had been prophesied.

The Received Text and Its Successors

The Greek New Testament was handed down in manuscripts, endlessly recopied in monasteries. After Gutenberg's invention of the printing press, the Greek New Testament was first brought out in 1516 by a Swiss printer, for whom the great humanist, Erasmus of Rotterdam, edited it hastily in order to get ahead of its publication in the great Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Ximinez (1514–1517). New and improved editions appeared subsequently—the fourth in 1527. In 1546, the French printer-editor Robert Stephanus issued a Greek New Testament based on the later editions of Erasmus. His third edition, of 1550, was the first Greek testament with a critical apparatus and became the "received text" for English printers until recent times. Because of his Protestantism, Stephanus was forced to quit Paris for Geneva, where he reprinted his work in 1557. This new printing was epochal in that it was provided not only with chapter divisions but with verse divisions. An edition based on that of Stephanus, as improved by the Reformed theologian, Theodore Beza and printed by the Dutch printing firm Elzevir at Leiden in 1624 and 1663, became the Continental "received text."

The manuscripts on which Erasmus and his successors based their editions were nearly all late Byzantine. It was thus a relatively poor text that served as the basis for such great Bible translations as Luther's New Testament of 1521 and Tyndale's of 1525 and the Authorized Version of 1611.

Considerable progress was made in evaluating and classifying manuscripts and suggesting improved readings in the eighteenth century, notably by Johann Albrecht Bengel (1734), Johann Jakob Wettstein (Wetstenius) (1751–52) and Johann Jakob Griesbach (1775). The last named, building on Bengel's labors, differentiated three great families of texts—the Western, the Alexandrian, and the Byzantine—an insight still valid today. As text editors these scholars, however, retained the Continental received text. The first impulse toward setting up a critical text was given in 1831 by the Germanic philologist Carl Lachmann, who held that the immediate objective was to establish the text that had been considered authoritative in East and West *c.* 380. His critical edition appeared in 1842 and 1850 (2 vols.). Unfortunately the materials available to him were too meager to enable him to progress far in his quest. His suggestions, however, stimulated the theologian Constantin von Tischendorf (1815–74), who ferreted out and edited some of the oldest and most important manuscripts, thereby laying the foundations for modern knowledge in this field.

It was natural that Tischendorf should seek to crown his labors with a critical edition of the New Testament. His *Editio Octava Major* (2 vols., 1869–72) became and still is an indispensable tool for scholars because of its information on readings of manuscripts and other ancient testimonies. As text editor, however, he particularly favored his great discovery, the *Codex Sinaiticus*. A new text then was set up in England in 1881 by the Cambridge scholars B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. They brought powerful support for the theory of three great families of texts developed by Bengel and Griesbach, calling them Neutral, Western, and Syrian. Their preference for the readings of the Vatican manuscript was shared by Bernhard Weiss in his independent approach of 1894–1900, but in addition, Weiss recognized the fact that restoration of the original cannot proceed mechanically, but goes hand in hand with interpretation. The philologist Friedrich Blass brought the D manuscript (see below), which in Acts has two recensions, into prominence in 1895, but he did not edit a whole New Testament. Hermann von Soden, however, in his work of 1902–13 undertook the ambitious task of collating and classifying the readings of all manuscripts then known, and in the process succeeded in ferreting out many new cursives. However, his attempt at more refined classification of the materials and his new system of designating them in accordance with his theory did not find favor. His *I*-text, with which he linked the Western and which he held to have originated at Caesarea, and his belief that most corruption of text was due to the influence of Tatian's Diatessaron encountered strong opposition. A good summary of his views is to be found in his introduction to his shorter edition of 1913.

For general purposes of students and scholars editions of the Greek Testament were produced which did not represent new research, but were compiled on the basis of the authorities mentioned. The most widely used has been that of Eberhard Nestle (24th edition, 1960). That of G. D. Kilpatrick (2d edition, 1958) has a real apparatus.

The Manuscripts

As we shall make occasional reference to manuscripts and versions, some selective information on these may be given here. New Testament manuscripts are of two kinds—*Uncials* (from Lat. *uncia,* inch), which are written throughout in capital letters, and *Cursives,* which are written in small letters. The Uncials are the older (4th–10th centuries); the Cursives date from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries.

In view of von Soden's new but unsatisfactory classification of manuscripts given in his *Prolegomena* (1902–10), there was general agreement that in order to prevent chaos a uniform system of designation should be set up. With the consent of other leading scholars, Caspar René Gregory, who had continued the work of Tischendorf, produced such a one in 1908. In his system the Uncials are listed with numbers to which a zero is prefixed, and the Cursives with plain numbers. However, for the great manuscripts the traditional designations, some of which go back to J. J. Wettstein, remain in vogue. As new manuscripts keep turning up, the list of 1908 requires supplementation. A completely up-to-date list was published in Germany in 1961 by Kurt Aland under the aegis of the *Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung* at the University of Münster.

Among the 241 Uncials, the following have an undisputed pre-eminence.

S (originally designated by the Hebrew letter *aleph*), *Codex Sinaiticus,* of the fourth century, containing the complete Bible. It was discovered at St. Catherine's Monastery at Mt. Sinai in 1859 by Tischendorf, acquired by him for the Russian Czar, and published under the latter's auspices. It was photographically reproduced by Kirsopp Lake in 1911. In 1933, it was bought from Soviet Russia by the British Museum.

A, *Codex Alexandrinus,* probably written in the fifth century. This manuscript containing the complete Bible allegedly was brought from the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria to Constantinople and was given in 1628 to Charles I of England by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople and great friend of Protestantism. It is now in the British Museum. Use was made of it in Brian Walton's Polyglot Bible of 1654–57. A photographic reproduction appeared in 1879–83.

B, *Codex Vaticanus,* of the fourth century, a complete Bible preserved in the

Vatican Library. The Roman Cardinal Angelo Mai, himself a great editor of ancient texts, withheld it from Tischendorf and published it in 1857. Tischendorf re-edited it in 1867. A photographic reproduction appeared in 1904.

C, *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus,* a fifth-century manuscript of the complete Bible in the National Library at Paris. The original writing had been sufficiently erased for the vellum to be written over again in the twelfth century with Homilies of St. Ephraem translated from the Syriac. It is thus what is known as a palimpsest. Tischendorf was able to perform the seemingly impossible feat of deciphering the underlying New Testament text. He published it in 1843–45.

D, *Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis,* a fifth-century manuscript originally preserved in the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons in France. Robert Stephanus made use of it in the third edition of his New Testament (1550). In the pillage of Lyons by the Huguenot soldiers in the first civil war, this manuscript fortunately was not destroyed, but came into the possession of Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor as leader of the Church of Geneva. Beza gave it to the University of Cambridge in 1581. It has been the subject of much interest and debate among scholars owing to its variant readings. It holds a particular prominence in the discussion of the text of Acts. It was published in facsimile at Cambridge, England, in 1899.

D_2, *Codex Claromontanus* (Pauline Epistles), a sixth-century Greek and Latin text (the Latin being important, too). Discovered by Theodore Beza in Clermont —hence the name—it was published by Tischendorf in 1852. It is in the National Library in Paris.

E_2 (Acts, Greek and Latin), *Codex Laudianus,* originally from Sardinia; from there it was brought to England, where it was already used by the Venerable Bede (eighth century). Boniface took it to Germany; from there it was carried off in the Thirty Years' War by the Swedes. It was given to Oxford University by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury (1633–45), from whom it gets its name.

W (Gospels), *Codex Washingtonianus,* Freer Collection, in Washington, D.C., late fourth- or early fifth-century manuscript of the Gospels, acquired in Egypt in 1906 by the great American collector of art, C. L. Freer. It was published photographically by Edgar J. Goodspeed in 1913. Different sections represent different kinds of text. Concerning the unique addition after Mk. 16:14, the so-called Freer-Logion, see p. 112.

The cursive or minuscule manuscripts number more than 2,500. The earliest dated one was written in 835. They generally represent the Byzantine form of text. There are, however, several groups among them which have attracted especial interest. First, there is the Ferrar group consisting of some manuscripts of the eleventh to fifteenth centuries. They often agree with Codex D. Then there is the so-called "family *1*" composed of four manuscripts of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. It was studied by Kirsopp Lake in 1902. The ninth-century Uncial Codex Koridethianus (Theta), to which von Soden called attention in 1906 and which gets its name from a monastery near the Caspian Sea, has an affinity with these two groups. B. H. Streeter showed in 1925 that Origen used this form of text in some of his works, and he advanced the theory that it represented a distinctive recension which he called Caesarean. But it is now thought that it may rather have been current in Egypt, for the Chester Beatty Gospel papyrus (cf. below) is of this stamp.

Versions

For the textual criticism of the New Testament, the early translations sometimes furnish important clues, for they bear witness to readings of the Greek manuscripts from which they were made.

The Semitic Translations. We have already referred to Tatian's Diatessaron (p. 2). Apparently not long after that work had been rendered into Syriac by its author, a Syriac translation of the four Gospels was made, called the *Evangelion da Mepharrĕshē* "The Gospel of the Separated Ones" (i.e., the separately rendered Gospels). Two manuscripts of this translation have survived: the first was discovered by William Cureton in an Egyptian monastery in 1842; the second, a palimpsest, was discovered in 1892 at the St. Catherine's monastery at Mt. Sinai by Agnes Smith Lewis and Margaret Dunlop Gibson. The term "Old Syriac" covers both, but when a special reading of the second manuscript is mentioned it is referred to as the Sinaitic Syriac. F. Crawford Burkitt edited the Old Syriac with a literal translation in 1904 (2 vols.). It was formerly regarded as belonging to the Western family, with which it often agrees in its readings, but some think this is due to the influence of Tatian's Diatessaron text. Strangely, the Old Syriac translation did not become established in the Syriac-speaking church of Mesopotamia. There the Diatessaron prevailed until the so-called *Peshitta,* "the simple" (perhaps meaning "the common" or "generally used one"), was promulgated in the fifth century by Bishop Rabbula of Edessa. The Peshitta belongs to the sphere of the Byzantine text. Later revisions of it were the Philoxenian of 508 and the Harkleian of 616.

There was also a Palestinian-Christian-Aramaic translation (sometimes referred to as the *Syropalaestina*) which apparently arose in the Antioch neighborhood and was used in Palestine as well. It is known chiefly from eleventh- and twelfth-century lectionary manuscripts found at the Sinaitic monastery by Mrs. Lewis, Mrs. Gibson and J. Rendel Harris, but in 1953 fragments of it came to light among fifth- to eighth-century materials found at *Khirbel Mird* in connection with the Dead Sea Scrolls explorations.

The Latin Translations. 1. The *Itala* or Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*). It has a special importance owing to its antiquity. It evidently arose in North Africa at the end of the second century, perhaps in a gradual process. It was extremely literal and thus permits ready inference as to the Greek from which it was rendered. It is the leading authority for the Western text and agrees markedly with Codex D and, as noted above, with the Old Syriac translation. Establishing the original text of the Old Latin version is, however, an exceedingly difficult undertaking (which is being carried out anew by the Benedictine monks of Beuron in Germany) owing to the variations in the manuscripts, which date from the fourth to the twelfth century. In textual notes Itala manuscripts are indicated by small italic letters.

2. The Vulgate. St. Jerome, the greatest biblical scholar of his time, at the request of the Roman Bishop Damasus made in A.D. 382, undertook a revision of the *Itala,* to bring it in conformity with the Greek texts then regarded as best

and to improve the Latin diction. But the old translation also continued in use. At the Council of Trent in 1546, however, Jerome's work was referred to as the *Vulgata,* "the one that was made general or common," and was declared the authoritative Bible of the Roman Catholic church. Not the text issued in 1590 under Pope Sixtus V, however, but the revised one of 1592 (published under Clement VIII and hence called the "Clementina") is the officially accepted one. The original text of the New Testament translation of St. Jerome can be recovered only with the aid of the oldest manuscripts. The task was undertaken by the English scholars John Wordsworth and H. J. White. Publication began in 1889 and had got only as far as Ephesians at White's death in 1934. It was completed in 1951 by H. F. D. Sparks and W. Adams, though White produced a serviceable *editio minor* of the whole New Testament in 1911.

Other Ancient Translations. The Coptic translation is preserved in two dialects: (1) the Bohairic (abbrev. *bo*), written in the dialect of lower Egypt, certainly not younger than the fourth to fifth centuries; it agrees generally with the Greek Uncials S and B; (2) the Sahidic (abbrev. *sa*) which is in the dialect of upper Egypt and agrees more with the "Western text" (Codex D, Old Latin, and Old Syriac); it may be slightly older than the Bohairic. New Coptic materials have been issued in the Bodmer series (cf. below).

Other ancient translations are the Gothic (fourth century), Armenian (fifth century), Ethiopic (fifth century). The first mentioned afford help along with the Peshitta in restoring the Byzantine text-form, which is not represented by any manuscript older than the ninth century. Behind the Armenian is said to lie a text which is partly Alexandrian and partly Western.

The Promise of Archaeological Discoveries

It will be noted that the oldest Uncials take us back only to the fourth century. From archaeological discoveries, however, have come papyri and scrolls which give considerably earlier clues to the text of the New Testament. Hope must be pinned on these—and others still buried in the ground or in caves—for further progress in the direction of unraveling the history of the New Testament text and getting back to the original readings.

The outstanding discovery in this field is that of the Chester Beatty biblical papyri. This American collector, resident in London, obtained from an Egyptian dealer a great collection said to have come from the region of ancient Aphroditopolis on the east bank of the Nile thirty miles south of Memphis. An additional thirty leaves were acquired by the University of Michigan. For the Pauline Epistles we here obtain a nearly complete manuscript from the beginning of the third century (Papyrus II, officially listed as P. 46). For the Gospels and Acts, portions of thirty leaves are extant (Papyrus I, now listed as P. 45 in the continuation of Gregory's Catalogue). For Revelation there are thirty-two leaves, containing Rev. 9:10–17:2.

An even more startling but severely limited discovery is that by C. H. Roberts of a fragment of the Gospel according to John (containing 18:31–33, 37, 38). It was found among papyri in the John Rylands Library in Manchester and published in 1935. It can be assigned to the first half of the second century. It is astonishing to find that this Gospel, believed to have originated in Asia Minor near the end of the first century (p. 270 f.), was known in Egypt at such an early date. The fragment is now listed as P. 52.

A collection comparable in importance to the Chester Beatty and said to have been found in Upper Egypt was acquired by the Bodmer Library at Geneva. The first to be issued under the editorship of V. Martin was Bodmer II (P. 66 in the continuation of Gregory's list), 1956. It gives the Gospel of John 1:1–14:26; fragments of the rest of John were issued in a supplement in 1958. This papyrus dates from about A.D. 200. It stands closer to Codex S in its text than to Codex B and raises the question whether Tischendorf was not more nearly right than Westcott-Hort. Bodmer XIV–XV (P. 75), issued in 1960, is a manuscript of Luke and John; it now contains Lk. 3:18–18:18; 22:4–24:53 and Jn. 1:1–15:8. If anything it is older than Bodmer II and of the same type. Bodmer VII–VIII (P. 72) was published in 1959. It contains Jude and 1–2 Peter, and was written in the third century. It shows that the text of these books remained rather constant. Bodmer XVII (P. 74) appeared in 1961. It is of later vintage than the others, being from the 6th or 7th centuries and contains Acts and the seven Catholic Epistles. The latter are fragmentary, that of James being the best preserved. Future text editors of the New Testament have a large task before them in utilizing and evaluating all these materials.

It was formerly thought that all early biblical manuscripts were papyrus rolls, and that the codex or book form appeared only with the use of parchment in the early fourth century. But the papyrus discoveries have shown that the codex form was already in use in Egypt with papyrus material at the beginning of the second century.

In connection with explorations for the Dead Sea Scrolls, some fragments of Greek biblical manuscripts were found at Khirbet Mird in 1953. Among them are said to be such of Uncials of Mark, John, and Acts, which date from the fifth to eighth centuries.

The Improvement of Translations

The vast labors of nineteenth-century biblical scholarship produced the feeling that revision of the King James Version was desirable in the interest of clearer understanding of the Scriptures. The English Revised Version of 1881–85 and the rival American Standard Revised Version of 1901 sought to meet this need. More recently, the Revised Standard Version (1946–52) was produced as a newer American revision of the Authorized Version, and is being widely used. A British project, the New English Bible, the New Testament portion of which appeared in 1961, is a new translation, based on present day scholarship, but with the ideal of making the ancient book contemporary with the help of the present-day language of the English-speaking people. Alongside such great collective undertakings stand the private ventures of individuals, such as James Moffatt (1913–22), Edgar J. Goodspeed (1923), and others. But the most accurate renditions as well as the most modernized ones cannot by themselves make ancient books come fully alive. They were the product of a different age, and there is no road back to their real appreciation except by means of historical elucidation.

Introduction to the Gospels

Gospel and Gospels

Originally "gospel" (Gr. *euangélion*), as Paul's use of the word shows, was the message concerning salvation through Jesus Christ. It could be described as "the proclamation" (Gr. *kḗrygma*) or as "the Word" (Gr. *logós*)—terms which show that it was an orally communicated message. Its essence was the assertion that Jesus was the Christ, and in the form of the message received by Paul (1 Cor. 15:1 f.) it was held that through his death and resurrection he had brought salvation. Mark's Gospel stands close to this view; it is basically a Passion narrative with a prelude showing how the Passion came about. "The gospel" is still an entity distinct from his book, but at the same time he is extending this concept to include the ministry of Jesus and briefly even that of John the Baptist. The proclamation of the gospel required such information, for when missionaries came into distant towns and preached about salvation through Jesus Christ, the first question people asked must naturally have been: "Who was Jesus, and what did he do and say?" If they were Jews they might also ask: "If you say he was the Christ where is his forerunner?" Mark's Gospel seeks to provide the narrative that will make such a brief summary as is given in Peter's sermon in Acts 10:34–43 more vivid. Matthew and Luke seek to perform the same service as Mark and tell of the ministry of Jesus, greatly increasing the information about his sayings, before relating the sacred story of the Passion. Even the Gospel according to John follows the basic pattern established by Mark. In one respect it adheres to it more closely than Matthew or Luke—in giving no infancy narrative.

The archaic formulation with which these books are designated in the ancient sources and in the manuscripts, "the gospel *according to* Mark," etc., still bears witness to the fact that "gospel" was not originally a book. However—already during the second century—men began to speak of "the Gospels" and even to call the individual book of this class a Gospel. A distinctive category for these writings was, indeed, a desideratum, for Greek literature had none into which they fitted. They are not "memoirs of the Apostles" as Justin Martyr thought, nor are they "Lives" as some scholars have called them, for there is no thought of a biographical approach such as was developed by Plutarch. The designation "Gospels," while hardly conveying anything immediately intelligible to ancient pagans, was eminently satisfactory to those who knew that these books imparted knowledge about Jesus Christ. Through Christian use the term became firmly established.

The four works of this kind that were recognized by the Church fall into two uneven groups of three and one. The first three tell the story of Jesus essentially in the same simple and direct manner, while the fourth is of an entirely different stamp—reflective and interpretative. The first three Gospels, furthermore, are clearly related to each other. This constitutes a problem with which generations of scholars have wrestled. One by-product of these efforts has been that the traditional idea of the origin of the Gospels that came down from the early Church Fathers has been undermined. This led to an entirely new approach—understanding the Gospels as compilations of traditional materials, oral and written, and to the question of their proper classification. Some account of the results of all this research is essential for the understanding of the commentary.

A. The Synoptic Problem

To see this interrelationship of the first three Gospels more clearly, it was found useful to arrange their text in parallel columns. An influential attempt to do this was made in 1774 by a German scholar already mentioned above, Griesbach, who in the Latin title called his work a *Synopsis* in the sense of a general view of these books. It soon became customary to speak of the first three Gospels as the Synoptic Gospels, or simply the Synoptics, and of the problem of their relationship as the Synoptic problem.

Various hypotheses were brought forward in the course of time to explain the very close kinship existing between the Synoptics. First, the possibility was explored that all three are independent recordings of the same oral tradition. Next came the idea that each was a compilation of brief, separately recorded materials or fragments. Then the thought that all three were dependent on a lost primitive Gospel was suggested. But none of these views could do justice to all the facts. In the end it became plain that there was no way out except to assume literary dependence of two upon one. St. Augustine had advanced the idea that Mark was an excerpt of Matthew and Luke. This, when restricted to Matthew and Mark and tested anew, did not work out. It seemed feasible, however, to hold that both Matthew and Luke used Mark as a basis for their books. In 1835, a theory to that effect was put forward by Carl Lachmann (see p. 7), and in 1838 two other scholars espoused the same view independently and apparently without knowledge of his work. It was indeed plain, once it was pointed out, that the entire material of the Gospel according to Mark, with slight exceptions is contained in Matthew and Luke. The whole basic framework of Mark was taken over by them. They diverge most widely from each other where they do not have Mark's guidance, as in the Nativity and post-resurrection narratives.

Once the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark was recognized, it became clear that this did not suffice to explain them; the two have materials in common that are not found in Mark, notably sayings of Jesus, though these are often differently distributed and sometimes diverge considerably in formulation. It seemed necessary to assume that they had a second common source, composed chiefly of sayings (Gr. *lógia*) of Jesus. This two-source theory was widely accepted in consequence of a work of H. J. Holtzmann in 1863. In 1900, Wernle called this *lógia* document "Q" (first letter of the German word *Quelle,* "source"), and the designation soon became used by all scholars. It is generally held that Luke has preserved the original sequence of the Q sayings more accurately than Matthew. Which Gospel has preserved a given saying closer to the original form can only be decided—tentatively—from case to case.

The Q source—or what was used of it by Matthew and Luke—can perhaps be reconstructed. Adolf Harnack made a valuable contribution in this direction in 1908. He held that Q was older than Mark, whereas Julius Wellhausen had maintained in 1905 that Mark was the earlier. The latter's position on this point seems to be more nearly correct. Since Mark reports sayings of Jesus that also appear in Q, one must assume that he used an earlier collection which contained matter that Q likewise received.

But the two-source theory still left a residue of Matthew and Luke unexplained, for both have matter that is peculiar to each. German scholars labeled this "S" (for Ger. *Sondergut,* "special material"). Not all scholars have been satisfied to leave the matter so vague. Thus the English scholar, B. H. Streeter, propounded the view in 1924 that each had another source which he labeled "M" (for Matthew's) and "L" (for Luke's). The former allegedly represents Jerusalem tradition and the latter that of Antioch. The L Source, Streeter held, was a combination of Q and special material (excluding Lk. 1–2 which he regarded as having been prefixed by the evangelist). But neither this view nor any other hypothesis has received sufficient support to permit one's putting it on a level with the two-source theory.

Mark also has some unique material (4:26–29; 7:32–37; 8:22–26). How is one to explain that these passages were not copied out by his successors? And why is Mark sometimes followed by Matthew only and at other times only by Luke? Some scholars have raised the question whether Matthew and Luke had Mark before them in different stages of development. They think, too, that more weight must be given to the continuance of oral tradition and its effect both in correction and in supplementation of written books. Gospel research thus is groping after new solutions. As yet, however, no convincing results have emerged. In the present work we shall adhere to the basic hypothesis of two main sources, Mark and Q, plus special materials of each author. It does not solve every riddle of Gospel relations, but it makes many things comprehensible, and thus has proved itself a useful instrument. Beyond it lies the province of the uncertain.

The literary critical movement was much concerned with the idea that, especially in the case of the Gospel according to Mark, it might be possible to get back to a proto-Mark of which the present Gospel is an expansion and adaptation. One might then have the bedrock material for the history of Jesus—preferably, to these scholars, a Jesus who was a great teacher, about whom legend had woven incredible tales. This hope was rudely dashed by works such as those of Wrede (1901), and Wellhausen (1905), which showed that this Gospel already was permeated with theological ideas. The contribution of K. L. Schmidt (1919) made evident that no reliance can be placed on the sequence of events in the ministry of Jesus as described in Mark, and thereby the rug was pulled out from under all "Lives of Christ."

B. FORM CRITICISM

The work of Schmidt opened the door for recognition of the fact that Mark and the other two Synoptics, where they bring new items, are basically a compilation of small units of tradition. The term used by Martin Dibelius in 1919 for a new approach in dealing with these was *Formgeschichte* ("form history"), for which English and American scholars commonly say "form criticism." He was stimulated by the type of study which Hermann Gunkel had so successfully introduced into the Old Testament field, as Gunkel in turn had been stimulated by work done in the field of Germanic folk literatures. The interest of Dibelius was focused on picking out the independent units, classifying them as to form, discovering the laws governing the form, and thereby detecting the changes the materials underwent, both before the Gospel author received them and in his adapting them to his use. The English translation of this pioneer work, *From Tradition to Gospel* (1935), indicates that the objective was to recover the process of the genesis of the Gospels via this traditio-historical study. The work of Dibelius was soon followed by Rudolf Bultmann's comprehensive *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921; Eng. trans., 1960), the second classic of the school of *Formgeschichte*. Such scholars as Vincent Taylor (1933) and Frederick C. Grant (1934) helped to acclimate form criticism in Britain and the United States.

The Background of the Early Gospel Tradition

The belief that the Gospel materials crystallized in the early Christian communities before they were gathered by the Gospel authors is the basic presupposition of form criticism and is confirmed by their very nature when viewed in the light of folk literature. They were from the very first handed down by Christian believers, and bore the stamp of their faith. Indeed, they were concerned with testifying to, and spreading, that faith. It thus is impossible to get back to a tradition which did not share in such faith.

That the real message of Jesus was entirely an apocalyptic message; that he proclaimed the imminent kingdom of God, the need for repentance, the kind of life required of those who would enter the kingdom had been made plain by Johannes Weiss (1892) and Albert Schweitzer (1901, 1906). This was fully accepted by Dibelius.

The first Christian communities, we may be sure, were not interested in cultivating historical reminiscences. The movement recruited itself from nonliterate elements of the population (cf. the remarks of Eusebius about the disciples of Jesus, *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 24). To those who had known or heard Jesus of Nazareth, he was sufficiently vivid. They stood under the influence of his person and teachings. He had been crucified, thus disappointing the hope of his first followers that he would reign as Israel's Messiah when the kingdom which he had proclaimed arrived. Through his resurrection appearances, however, that hope had been reconstituted and changed into an expectation of his return as the Son of man of Dan. 7:13. It became a confession of faith in his coming Messiahship that he was referred to as Jesus the Christ and as Son of man.

But soon a shift took place in Christian thinking—away from what-was-to-come to emphasis on what-had-been-done. Our oldest authority is Paul's account of the Christian message in 1 Cor. 15:1. It stressed the Passion of Jesus and viewed his death as atonement. His resurrection not only had significance for himself, but for all persons believing in him. His last supper was repeated ritually, and the story of its institution was the sacred lesson for the occasion (1 Cor. 11:23 ff.). At times, notably at the Passover season, there must have been an interest in hearing more about the Passion. Incidents reported by certain traditioners such as the youth of Mk. 14:51 f., the sons of Simon of Cyrene, 15:21, and followers of Peter were strung together, and full-fledged cycles came into existence. These had a cultic use, as Georg Bertram showed (1922). This Passion narrative may have sufficed at first for Christian needs in so far as the story of Jesus was concerned. For the guidance of the life of the congregations, words and sayings of Jesus, and no doubt missionary and organizational directives newly given by apostolic authorities, must have been utilized. The Qumran *Rule of the Community* (called *Manual of Discipline* by its editor) gives us an idea of the kind of regulations that the Apostles may have laid down.

It is worthy of note that Paul, our earliest witness of Christian teaching, nowhere stresses or refers to wonder-working by Jesus. One may ask whether he had any knowledge of such, for it seems to run contrary to the idea of Christ's state of humiliation of Phil. 2:7–8. His interest is focused on the atoning death and victorious resurrection of the Son of God. Paul, however, was familiar with sayings of Jesus. He is able to quote such and regards them as authoritative (1 Cor. 7:10; cf. Acts 20:35). He can also remark that on a certain topic no saying of Jesus is known to him (1 Cor. 11:23 f.).

The Sayings of Jesus

What was the life situation for which the sayings of Jesus were brought forward? Dibelius sees it in the need for exhortation (Gr. *paraínesis;* Ger. *Paränese*). Paul refers to his oral instruction of this kind in 1 Thess. 4:1 f. and often concludes his letters with a section giving such exhortation—not for any particular reason, but just on general principles. It is now recognized that much of the substance has simply been adapted from Hellenistic-Jewish sources. The words of Jesus as Paul knew them evidently did not lend themselves to this practical end or he would have quoted more of them.

When interest began to turn to what Christ had said and done, the tendency arose to use sayings of Jesus himself for exhortation. Jesus had of course spoken Hebrew or Aramaic, and what he had said had to be translated into Greek. The hypothetical Q document was already a Greek document. In the translation, assembling, and editing of sayings of Jesus, the insistence on exactitude was not quite the same as with the legal matter of the rabbis, for the Christians believed in the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit. What was handed down could be reformulated with an eye to Christian needs. The tradition of what the Lord Jesus had said was often influenced by the conviction of what he would say *now*. Supplementary elements could creep in, original elements could be lost. One need only compare the divergent forms of the Beatitudes (Mt. 5:3 f., Lk. 6:20 f.), or of the

Lord's prayer (Mt. 6:9–13; Lk. 11:2–4), or of the accounts of the Lord's Supper (Mk. 14:22–25; Mt. 26:26–29; Lk. 22:15–20; 1 Cor. 11:23–25) to see how difficult it is to recover his exact words.

The arrangement of sayings of Jesus into discourses is often a mosaic of small pieces. Sometimes the individual units are merely linked together by key words or association of ideas. Sometimes the editor has construed them to serve his purpose, whereas taken by themselves they point to a different meaning. The Sermon on the Mount we naturally think of as an actual sermon preached by Jesus. But the fact that Luke has it in shorter form as a Sermon on the Plain and uses many of the same sayings in other connections than Matthew does, shows that the latter built up this discourse editorially. The alternative explanation that Luke dismembered so excellent and impressive a composition is most improbable. When we compare the Gospels we find the individual authors using the same sayings of Jesus for different purposes. This shows that the saying itself is the primary thing and the connection in which it appears may be a construction of the evangelist.

From the form-critical angle, one may sort out the following kinds of sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels: (1) Wisdom sayings similar to those of the book of Proverbs; (2) parables. These, one might think, would include only fictitious stories told to illustrate a certain point or to convey a specific message; but the term (Gr. *parabolḗ*) is used more broadly in the New Testament itself, as indeed was already the case in the Old Testament with the Hebrew *māshāl*. (The work of Joachim Jeremias, 1947, shows to what extent allegorical and hortatory interpretations have been overlaid on the original parables.); (3) rules of conduct (though these are usually diluted from the original eschatologically oriented requirement-sayings, in which Jesus confronted men with the will of God); (4) exhortations; (5) prophetic or apocalyptic sayings; (6) sayings in which Jesus speaks of himself and his mission.

A distinctive feature in the sayings of Jesus is the frequent *amen* (commonly rendered "verily") used at the beginning of a saying for solemn emphasis. Although "amen" is a Hebrew word, it is nowhere used in this same manner in rabbinic sources. We shall speak of "Amen sayings" but mean no form-critical category therewith.

Dibelius found four classes of stories in the Gospels. He called the first and most important one *Paradigmata,* or examples (cf. the fact that Aristotle used Gr. *parádeigma* in his *Rhetoric* for the illustration employed by the orator), and he held that they first were formulated orally in preaching. He was careful to state that he was thinking not merely of the religious address, but was including teaching and liturgical use. The second main group he called *Novellen* ("tales") and considered them as being of literary origin.

A rival classification was offered by Bultmann. He differentiated between "miracle stories" and others which have their point in a saying of Jesus, and which group he called *Apothegmata,* holding that they were not spoken by Jesus at all but grew out of controversies and discussions in the Primitive Church. It is, however, an unproved assumption that there was much controversy in the Primitive Church other than that of which we hear in Paul's Epistles and in Acts. To speak of miracle stories is of course legitimate, but this is a material rather than a formal classification. The term "Apothegmata" is unsatisfactory in English, since apothegm to us is a proverbial saying, and does not suggest a story.

In recent years the fundamental presupposition of Dibelius that the paradigmata crystallized as preaching illustrations has been contested. Stendahl (1934) stressed the teaching idea, holding that "the servants of the word" (Lk. 1:2) were a distinct class of men, who communicated such historical instruction by way of supplementing the preaching of the gospel by the Apostles. Riesenfeld (1957), on the other hand, argued that the Epistles reflect the nature of the early preaching, and that since they make no use of stories of Jesus these were not employed in it. The stories, he held, were formulated for lectionary use in worship. (As noted above, Dibelius had made allowance for such possibilities in his definition of "preaching.")

It cannot be said that the theory of the use of paradigmata in actual preaching has been successfully undermined. Papias, at the beginning of the second century, certainly had the idea that Mark derived his historical information from the preaching of Peter (see p. 33), and since Papias knew men who had been pupils of the Apostles it seems unlikely that his impression of the nature of apostolic preaching is wholly incorrect. The one advantage the companions of Jesus had over others was that they could speak of what they had seen and heard, and it seems wholly unlikely that they would not have made the most of it. Naturally in the literary sermons formulated by Luke in Acts it was impossible to relate incidents of the life of Jesus without lapsing from the genre he was employing. In the orations reported in the narratives of Greek historians there is likewise no space for the paradigmata of the orator of which Aristotle speaks. That the Epistles of the New Testament are representative of apostolic preaching and prove that this preaching made no use of paradigmata is likewise unconvincing. Since Paul had not been a companion of Jesus he did not have the firsthand impressions to narrate. His account of the Lord's Supper was a received one and is quoted only because of its importance for a rite customary in the churches. We have no authentic epistles of companions of Jesus. The allusions in 2 Pet. 1:16–18, Heb. 5:7 reflect knowledge of the traditions about Jesus by late epistle-writers, and show the sort of thing that might have been done by actual companions of Jesus had they felt impelled to write letters.

On general grounds, however, it seems desirable to choose terminology that contains no commitment to any theory. We shall in the present work substitute "the simple story" for the Paradigma and the "elaborate story" for the "Novelle." In this way the categories which Dibelius accurately observed and described can be utilized to obtain insight into the formation and metamorphosis of tradition.

1. The Simple Story. To this class the following eight stories from Mark are assigned by Dibelius as relatively pure examples:

The Healing of the Paralytic, 2:1–12
The Question about Fasting, 2:18–20
The Plucking of Grain, 2:23–28
The Healing of the Lame Hand, 31:1–6
The Family of Jesus, 3:31–35

Blessing of the Children, 10:13–16
The Tribute to Caesar, 12:13–17
The Anointing in Bethany, 14:3–9

Eight others from Mark and two from Luke are less true to type:

The Healing in the Synagogue, 1:23–28
The Call of Levi, 2:13–17
Jesus at Nazareth, 6:1–6
The Rich Youth, 10:17–22
Jesus and the Sons of Zebedee, 10:35–45
Jesus and the Blind Man of Jericho, 10:46–52
Cleansing of the Temple, 11:15–19
The Question of the Sadducees, 12:18–23
The Inhospitable Samaritans, Lk. 9:51–56
Healing of the Man with the Dropsy, Lk. 14:1–6

This type of story is well rounded, presupposes no connection with what precedes or follows, and has a point in itself. Other characteristics are brevity and simplicity; there is no trace of the raconteur's pleasure of narrating colorfully and effectively. The setting is indicated in only its barest essentials, and there is no attempt to portray individual character. The healing narratives usually deal with unidentified persons (an exception being that of Bartimaeus, Mk. 10:46 f., but perhaps this is a case of secondary identification of an originally unnamed individual; cf. Mt. 9:27–31). The manner of composition is religious; terms used technically in the Church or derived from Old Testament language may occur in it. A fourth characteristic is that the importance of the story lies in a saying of Jesus. A fifth characteristic is an effective close of the story either by such a saying or by relating the execution of what was directed, or by a concluding chorus in which God or Jesus is acclaimed. This type of narrative seems to take us closest to the events.

2. The Elaborate Story. Dibelius finds nine such stories in Mark and one (slightly modified) in Luke:

The Healing of the Leper, 1:40–45
The Calming of the Tempest, 4:35–41
The Gerasene Demoniac, 5:1–20
The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with Issue of Blood, 5:21–43
The Feeding of the Five Thousand, 6:35–44
The Walking on the Water, 6:45–52
The Healing of the Deaf and Dumb Man, 7:32–37
The Blind Man of Bethsaida, 8:22–26
The Epileptic Boy, 9:14–29
The Youth of Nain, Lk. 7:11–17

To these may be added the following stories in the Gospel according to John (omitting the obvious parallels 6:1–13 and 6:14–21).

The Marriage at Cana, 2:1–11
The Son of the Royal Official, 4:46–54

The Lame Man at the Pool of Bethesda, 5:1 ff.
The Man Born Blind, 9:1 ff.
The Awakening of Lazarus, 11:1 ff.

The elaborate story is likewise complete in itself and is easily removable from the context. It is characterized by the inclusion of colorful detail, as though the narrator were enjoying the telling of it. It seeks to satisfy curiosity, for we learn things that we do not need to know, whereas in the first type of story only the barest, most indispensable information is furnished. The pious words and phrases are lacking, and there is no central importance given to a saying of Jesus. The interest is in describing him as the wonderworker and in the techniques he used, the gestures he made, or in the potent formula he uttered. In such stories, we may find detailed description of symptoms of illness. In the conclusion, confirmation of the miraculous act is the important thing, however simple the device. Sometimes the "chorus" utterance serves this purpose. Dibelius held these tales to have been written for circulation among Christians, and not, like the first group, to have been recorded from oral preaching examples. They invite comparison with Hellenistic miracle tales. They are influenced by the current style of such story-telling, and thus reveal contact with the outside world on the part of those who formulated them. Contrary to the impression of the reader, they are not more reliable than the simple stories because of their detail; they are actually further removed from the facts. In reproducing the Marcan stories of this nature, Matthew and Luke show a tendency to delete human-interest elements and thus to transform them into "simple stories."

The side-by-side existence of simple and elaborate stories in Mark's Gospel confirms the belief that he was working with received materials. A single traditioner or a single author could be expected to have carried one type of narration through consistently.

3. The Sacred Legend. A third type of narrative, not extensively used in the Gospels, is the sacred legend (the word used in its primary sense: "a story of life as of a saint"). Christians were interested in hearing something about persons of sacred history. The story of Zaccheus (Lk. 19:1–10) is a typical story about a certain individual with whom Jesus came in contact, and whose person rather than the person of Jesus holds the center of the stage in it. By contrast, one may mention the story of the end of Judas (Mt. 27:1–10). Some Marcan narratives have been transformed into legends or provided with a new legendary element by Matthew and Luke: the Nazareth Episode (Lk. 4:16–30; cf. Mk. 6:1–6), the Calling of Peter (Lk. 5:1–11; cf. Mk. 1:16–17), the Anointing of Jesus (Lk. 7:36–50; cf. Mk. 14:3–9), Walking on the Water (Mt. 14:28–33; cf. Mk. 6:47–52), and the Confession of Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 16:13–20; cf. Mk. 8:27–30). The mood of sacred legend is particularly noteworthy in the case of the finding of the ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1–10), and the finding of the room for the Last Supper (Mk. 14:12–16). The Nativity stories in Mt. 1:18–2:23 and Lk. 1:5–2:40 are sacred legends concerned with the idea of the child of destiny (John and Jesus originally being parallel Messianic figures).

4. The Mythical Story. A fourth type of narrative, the mythical story, has only meager representation in the Gospels. The pure myth in which gods appear among men (cf. the assumption of the people of Lystra, Acts 14:11 ff.) is of course not found, but the idea of the Son of God carrying on a ministry on earth and revealing his divine nature through his miraculous acts veers toward the mythical. Individual stories in which mythical elements are particularly noticeable are: the Baptism; the Temptation; Walking on the Water; the Transfiguration; the Marriage at Cana; and the reports of the post-resurrection appearances of the Lord. In the Fourth Gospel, the Jesus of history is transformed entirely into the heavenly messenger and revealer, and hence into a mythical figure, though his true humanity is at the same time paradoxically affirmed. (Recognition of the mythological in the New Testament faith led in 1941 to Bultmann's demand of *Entmythologisirung,* i.e., that Christian doctrine must discount this element. This was done long ago without this catchword by the old-line liberals and the school of comparative religion, but was now proposed anew from the angle of an existentialist theology.)

There naturally is great resistance to the terms "legend" and "myth" as applied to Gospel materials. But the basis of all true insight lies in the classification of phenomena, and if these were stories occurring in nonbiblical sources there would be little dissent. However, those to whom this terminology is still repugnant can follow the example of Bornkamm (1956), who has described what Dibelius called legends and mythical stories as "stories of the Christ"—fully presupposing faith in a heavenly Lord. (Dibelius would probably have insisted that his first two categories, which Bornkamm reduces to "stories about Jesus," presuppose this faith too.)

The Theology of the Gospels

Literary criticism and form criticism having attained their goals in considerable measure, scholars turned to the contribution of the Gospel authors. It was realized that they were not merely compilers, but had their individual slant. Particularly influential was the study of Luke's theology by Conzelmann (1954). Concerning Mark, the most essential things had been set forth long ago by Wrede. But Marxsen (1956) and James M. Robinson (1956, 1957) have made fresh contributions to the discussion about this Gospel. As to Matthew Bornkamm, Barth and Held dealt significantly with aspects of that work (1960). All this undoubtedly represents a necessary supplementation of what had been previously accomplished in the study of the Synoptics.

The Fourth Gospel

John's Gospel, as already observed, is in a class by itself. True, it contains some received stories of the elaborate type, as noted on p. 20, though they have been considerably remodeled by the author. But John is not a mosaic of small pieces of tradition loosely put together, as is the case with Mark and his successors. Instead of sayings of Jesus, we find lengthy discourses of a very different type. It is unthinkable that Jesus should have spoken one way at one time and another way at another time. The Synoptic sayings, we must hold, give us the true manner of his speaking, while the Johannine discourses are this author's work.

The horizons for the study of John have been vastly extended in recent years, as scholars realized that this book must be seen against the background of early gnosis. As Bousset first made plain (1903, 1907), the root of Oriental gnosis lay in Iranian dualism. The study of Siegfried Schulz on the discourses in John (1960) lists as important new sources: the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Mandean texts (to which Reitzenstein called attention in 1919, 1921), the Manichean *Turfan* texts from Chinese Turkestan, the Gnostic texts from *Nag Ḥamādī* and the newly discovered Vatican Pentateuch Targum (*Neofiti* I), all of which have a bearing on the exegesis of this Gospel. It is obvious that decades will go by before all these materials are digested and their relevance for the gnosis with which John was familiar, appraised.

The Apocryphal Gospels

Since we are speaking of the Gospels, a few words about the apocryphal Gospels may not be out of place. The Church Fathers mention a number of them and even give a few quotations. One of these was the Gospel according to Peter, of which a fragment containing sixty verses dealing with the Passion and resurrection was found in an Egyptian grave and published in 1902. Among the papyri from Oxyrhynchus, too, fragmentary Gospel materials came to light, notably Pap. 840, which relates an incident in the Synoptic manner (see p. 88). In 1935, Papyrus Egerton 2 was published. It also contained some incidents of an interesting nature. But the great find of Gnostic materials at *Nag Ḥamādī* in Egypt in 1945 brought to light apocryphal Gospels, which while preserved only in Coptic, had been translated from the Greek. One of these is the Jung Codex of Zürich published in 1956 by Malinine, Puech and Quispel, called "the Gospel of Truth." Of still greater interest, however, is the Gospel according to Thomas. Text and English translation were published by Guillaumont, Puech, Quispel and Till in 1959. It contains amid obviously Gnostic inventions many sayings of Jesus found in the Synoptics, sometimes in slightly different form. This raises the question whether there is dependence on the Synoptics (so R. M. Grant, 1959) or on other apocryphal Gospels (so Quispel), or whether there was a continuance of oral tradition receiving both pure and impure (Gnostic) elements.

In one respect we find this Gospel particularly instructive: in its method of presentation. It generally passes from one unit to another with a simple "Jesus said" or "he said"; sometimes this is made more specific: "he said to his disciples." But ofttimes a unit begins with what the disciples or some person said to Jesus (or to others), and then gives the response of Jesus. There are also a few units which begin in narrative form, giving a brief hint of the occasion of a saying, e.g., "Jesus saw children who were being suckled" (22); "they saw a Samaritan carrying a lamb on his way to Judaea" (60); "a woman from the multitude said to him" (79); "they showed Jesus a gold (coin) and said to him" (100). It may well be that we here have continuance of the earliest form of written tradition. Dibelius often had the impression that what the Synoptic authors had available was merely a saying, or a saying with a brief hint of the situation in which it was spoken, and that by inference they developed such a one into a narrative unit. This now has become extremely probable.

Table of the Parallel Gospels

THE INFANCY NARRATIVES

A. The Matthean Infancy Narrative 1:1–2:23

The Genealogy of Jesus	1:1–17
The Birth of Jesus	1:18–25
The Wise Men from the East	2:1–12
Flight to Egypt and Return	2:13–23

B. The Lucan Infancy Narrative 1:1–2:52

The Prologue	1:1–4
The Prediction of the Birth of John	1:5–25
The Annunciation	1:26–38
Mary Visits Elizabeth; the Magnificat	1:39–56
The Birth of John	1:57–80
The Birth of Jesus	2:1–20
Circumcision and Presentation of Jesus	2:21–40
An Episode of Jesus' Boyhood	2:41–52

PART I THE GALILEAN PERIOD

Mk. 1–9; Mt. 3–18; Lk. 3:1–9:50

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
John the Baptist	1:1–6	3:1–6	3:1–6
John's Preaching of Repentance		3:7–10	3:7–9
John's Advice to Special Groups			3:10–14
John's Preaching concerning the Messiah	1:7–8	3:11–12	3:15–18
John's Imprisonment			3:19–20
The Baptism of Jesus	1:9–11	3:13–17	3:21–22
The Genealogy of Jesus			3:23–38
The Temptation	1:12–13	4:1–11	4:1–13
Appearance of Jesus in Galilee	1:14–15	4:12–17	4:14–15
Jesus in the Synagogue at Nazareth			4:16–30
The Call of the First Disciples	1:16–20	4:18–22	
Jesus in the Synagogue at Capernaum	1:21–28		4:31–37
The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law	1:29–31		4:38–39
Healings at Eventide	1:32–34		4:40–41

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Departure from Capernaum	1:35–38		4:42–43
Itinerant Preaching in Galilee	1:39	4:23–25	4:44
The Great Catch of Fish			5:1–11

The Sermon on the Mount

Mt. 5–7

Introduction		5:1–2	
The Beatitudes		5:3–12	
The Similes of Salt and Light		5:13–16	
The Attitude of Jesus toward the Law		5:17–20	
On Homicide		5:21–26	
On Adultery		5:27–30	
On Divorce		5:31–32	
On Oaths		5:33–37	
On Retaliation		5:38–42	
On Love of One's Enemies		5:43–48	
On Almsgiving		6:1–4	
On Prayer		6:5–8	
The Lord's Prayer		6:9–13 (+14–15)	
On Fasting		6:16–18	
On Treasures		6:19–21	
Parable of the Eye		6:22–23	
On Serving Two Masters		6:24	
On Cares		6:25–34	
On Judging		7:1–5	
On Casting Pearls		7:6	
On Answer to Prayer		7:7–11	
The Golden Rule		7:12	
The Narrow Gate		7:13–14	
The Test of Goodness		7:15–20	
Warning against Self-Deception		7:21–23	
Concluding Parables		7:24–27	
The Effect of the Sermon		7:28–29	

The Healing of a Leper	1:40–45	8:1–4	5:12–16
The Centurion of Capernaum		8:5–13	
The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law		8:14–15	
Healings at Eventide		8:16–17	
Diverse Followers		8:18–22	
The Calming of the Tempest		8:23–27	
The Gadarene Demoniacs		8:28–34	
The Healing of a Paralytic	2:1–12	9:1–8	5:17–26
The Call of Levi and Association with Publicans	2:13–17	9:9–13	5:27–32
The Question about Fasting	2:18–22	9:14–17	5:33–39
The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood		9:18–26	
The Healing of Two Blind Men		9:27–31	
The Healing of a Dumb Demoniac		9:32–34	
The Sending out of the Disciples		9:35–10:16	
The Lot of the Disciples		10:17–25	
Exhortation to Fearless Confession		10:26–33	
Division in the Household		10:34–36	

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Conditions of Discipleship		10:37–39	
Conclusion of the Discourse		10:40–11:1	
The Question of the Baptist		11:2–6	
Jesus' Testimony concerning John		11:7–19	
Woes over Galilean Cities		11:20–24	
The Utterance of Rejoicing		11:25–27	
The Invitation to Those with Burdens		11:28–30	
Plucking Grain on the Sabbath	2:23–28	12:1–8	6:1–5
The Healing of the Withered Hand	3:1–6	12:9–14	6:6–11
Jesus Heals the Crowds	3:7–12	12:15–21	6:17–19
The Election of the Twelve	3:13–19		6:12–16

Sermon on the Plain

Lk. 6:20–49

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Beatitudes			6:20–23
Four Woes			6:24–26
On Love of One's Enemies			6:27–36
On Judging			6:37–42
The Test of Goodness			6:43–46
Concluding Parables			6:47–49

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Centurion of Capernaum			7:1–10
The Youth of Nain			7:11–17
The Question of John the Baptist			7:18–23
Jesus' Testimony concerning John			7:24–35
The Penitent Woman in the House of Simon			7:36–50
The Ministering Women			8:1–3
The Pharisaic Accusation	3:20–22	12:22–24	
The Defense of Jesus	3:23–30	12:25–37	
Against Seeking for Signs		12:38–42	
The Saying on Relapse		12:43–45	
Jesus' True Relatives	3:31–35	12:46–50	
Parable of the Sower	4:1–9	13:1–9	8:4–8
The Reason for Parables	4:10–12	13:10–15	8:9–10
Blessed Eyewitnesses		13:16–17	
The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower	4:13–20	13:18–23	8:11–15
Concerning the Right Use of Parables	4:21–25		8:16–18
Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly	4:26–29		
Parable of the Tares		13:24–30	
Parable of the Mustard Seed	4:30–32	13:31–32	
Parable of the Leaven		13:33	
The Parabolic Way of Teaching	4:33–34	13:34–35	
The Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares		13:36–43	
Parables of the Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl of Great Price		13:44–46	
Parable of the Dragnet		13:47–50	
Conclusion of the Parable Discourse		13:51–52	
Jesus' True Relatives			8:19–21
The Calming of the Tempest	4:35–41		8:22–25

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Gerasene Demoniac	5:1–20		8:26–39
The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood	5:21–43		8:40–56
Jesus Rejected in Nazareth	6:1–6a	13:53–58	
The Sending out of the Disciples	6:6b–13		9:1–6
Herod's Opinion of Jesus	6:14–16	14:1–2	9:7–9
The Death of the Baptist	6:17–29	14:3–12	
The Return of the Disciples and the Feeding of the Five Thousand	6:30–44	14:13–21	9:10–17
Walking on the Water	6:45–52	14:22–33	
The Return to Gennesar	6:53–56	14:34–36	
On the Washing of Hands	7:1–23	15:1–20	
The Canaanite Woman	7:24–30	15:21–28	
The Healing of the Deaf and Dumb Man; The Healing of Many Sick	7:31–37	15:29–31	
The Feeding of the Four Thousand	8:1–10	15:32–39	
The Pharisees Demand a Sign	8:11–13	16:1–4	
A Discourse on Leaven	8:14–21	16:5–12	
The Blind Man of Bethsaida	8:22–26		
The Messianic Confession of Peter; the First Passion Announcement; Peter Rebuked	8:27–33	16:13–23	9:18–22
The Disciples' Path of Suffering	8:34–9:1	16:24–28	9:23–27
The Transfiguration	9:2–8	17:1–8	9:28–36
Conversation during the Descent from the Mount	9:9–13	17:9–13	
The Healing of an Epileptic Boy	9:14–29	17:14–21	9:37–43a
The Second Passion Announcement	9:30–32	17:22–23	9:43b–45
The Temple Tax		17:24–27	
The Dispute concerning Rank	9:33–37	18:1–5	9:46–48
The Strange Exorcist	9:38–41		9:49–50
About Offenses	9:42–48	18:6–9	
On Salt	9:49–50		
The Saving of the Lost		18:10–14	
On Reproving One's Brother		18:15–20	
On Reconciliation		18:21–22	
Parable of the Unmerciful Servant		18:23–35	

LUKE'S TRAVEL SECTION

9:51–18:14

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Samaritan Village			9:51–56
Diverse Followers			9:57–60
The Mission of the Seventy			10:1–16
The Return of the Seventy			10:17–20
The Utterance of Rejoicing			10:21–22
Blessed Eyewitnesses			10:23–24
The Greatest Commandment			10:25–29
Parable of the Good Samaritan			10:30–37
Mary and Martha			10:38–42
The Lord's Prayer			11:1–4
Parable of the Friend at Midnight			11:5–8

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Answer to Prayer			11:9–13
Jesus and Beelzebul			11:14–23
Saying on Relapse			11:24–26
Blessedness of Jesus' Mother			11:27–28
Against Seeking for Signs			11:29–32
About Light			11:33–36
Discourse against Pharisaism			11:37–12:1
Exhortation to Fearless Confession			12:2–12
Parable of the Rich Fool			12:13–21
Cares about Earthly Things			12:22–34
Watchfulness and Faithfulness			12:35–46
The Servant's Reward			12:47–48
Seriousness of the Times			12:49–56
Coming to Terms with One's Adversary			12:57–59
The Call to Repentance; Parable of the Fig Tree			13:1–9
Healing of the Bent Woman			13:10–17
Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven			13:18–21
Israel Threatened with Exclusion from the Kingdom			13:22–30
Departure from Galilee			13:31–33
Prophecy over Jerusalem			13:34–35
The Healing of the Man with the Dropsy			14:1–6
Discourses at Table			14:7–14
Parable of the Great Supper			14:15–24
Conditions of Discipleship			14:25–35
Parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Piece of Silver			15:1–10
Parable of the Prodigal Son			15:11–32
Parable of the Unjust Steward			16:1–13
Condemnation of the Conceit of the Pharisees			16:14–15
About the Law and about Divorce			16:16–18
The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus			16:19–31
On Offenses			17:1–2
On Being Conciliatory			17:3–4
On Faith			17:5–6
The Reward of the Servant			17:7–10
The Healing of Ten Lepers			17:11–19
Concerning the Kingdom of God			17:20–21
The Days of the Son of Man			17:22–37
Parable of the Unjust Judge			18:1–8
Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican			18:9–14

PART II THE JUDAEAN PERIOD

Mk. 10–15; Mt. 19–27; Lk. 18:15–23:56

A. The Journey to Jerusalem

Mk. 10; Mt. 19–20; Lk. 18:15–19:27

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Marriage and Divorce	10:1–12	19:1–12	
Jesus and the Children	10:13–16	19:13–15	18:15–17
On the Peril of Wealth	10:17–31	19:16–30	18:18–30
Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard		20:1–16	
The Third Passion Announcement	10:32–34	20:17–19	18:31–34
Jesus and the Sons of Zebedee	10:35–45	20:20–28	
The Healing of the Blind Man at Jericho	10:46–52	20:29–34	18:35–43
Zacchaeus			19:1–10
The Parable of the Minas			19:11–27

B. The Days in Jerusalem

Mk. 11–13; Mt. 21–25; Lk. 19:28–21:38

The Entry into Jerusalem	11:1–10	21:1–9	19:28–38
Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem			19:39–44
Jesus in the Temple; Its Cleansing	11:11	21:10–17	19:45–48
The Cursing of the Fig Tree	11:12–14	21:18–20	
The Cleansing of the Temple	11:15–19		
The Conversation about the Withered Fig Tree	11:20–26	21:20–22	
The Question about Authority	11:27–33	21:23–27	20:1–8
Parable of the Two Sons		21:28–32	
Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen	12:1–12	21:33–46	20:9–19
Parable of the Marriage Feast		22:1–14	
The Question of the Pharisees	12:13–17	22:15–22	20:20–26
The Question of the Sadducees	12:18–27	22:23–33	20:27–40
The Question about the Greatest Commandment	12:28–34	22:34–40	
The Son of David	12:35–37	22:41–46	20:41–44
Discourse against Pharisaism	12:38–40	23:1–36	20:45–47
Prophecy over Jerusalem		23:37–39	
The Widow's Mite	12:41–44		21:1–4
Prediction of the Destruction of the Temple	13:1–4	24:1–3	21:5–7

The Synoptic Apocalypse

Mk. 13:5–37; Mt. 24:4–36; Lk. 21:8–36

Signs of the Second Coming	13:5–8	24:4–8	21:8–11
Admonitions for the Beginning of the Sufferings	13:9–13	24:9–14	21:12–19
The Crisis in Judaea	13:14–20	24:15–22	21:20–24

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Admonitions for the Culmination of the Crisis	13:21–23	24:23–25	
The Day of the Son of Man		24:26–28	
The Second Coming of the Son of Man	13:24–27	24:29–31	21:25–28
Parable of the Fig Tree	13:28–29	24:32–33	21:29–31
The Time of the Second Coming	13:30–32	24:34–36	21:32–33
Conclusion of the Discourse	13:33–37		
The Lucan Conclusion of the Discourse			21:34–36

Parables of the Return		24:37–41	
Parable of the Watchful Householder		24:42–44	
The Faithful and Wise Servant and the Bad Servant		24:45–51	
Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins		25:1–13	
Parable of the Talents		25:14–30	
Description of the Last Judgment		25:31–46	
Summary Remark concerning the Ministry in Jerusalem			21:37–38

C. THE PASSION NARRATIVE

Mk. 14–15; Mt. 26–27; Lk. 22–23

The Plot of the High Priests and Scribes	14:1–2	26:1–5	22:1–2
The Anointing in Bethany	14:3–9	26:6–13	
The Betrayal by Judas	14:10–11	26:14–16	22:3–6
Preparations for the Passover	14:12–16	26:17–19	22:7–13

The Last Supper

Mk. 14:17–25; Mt. 26:20–29; Lk. 22:14–38

The Beginning of the Meal (and Designation of the Traitor)	14:17–21	26:20–25	22:14(21–23)
The Institution of the Lord's Supper	14:22–25	26:26–29	22:15–20
Last Utterances of Jesus			22:21–38

On the Way to the Mount of Olives; Prediction of Peter's Denial	14:26–31	26:30–35	22:39 (cf. 22:31–34)
Gethsemane	14:32–42	26:36–46	22:40–46
The Betrayal and Arrest	14:43–52	26:47–56	22:47–53
Jesus before the Synedrium; Peter's Denial	14:53–72	26:57–75	22:54–71
Jesus Delivered to Pilate	15:1	27:1–2	23:1
The End of Judas		27:3–10	
The Trial before Pilate	15:2–5	27:11–14	23:2–5
Jesus before Herod Antipas			23:6–16
The Sentence of Death	15:6–15	27:15–26	23:17–25
The Mocking of Jesus	15:16–20	27:27–31	
On the Way to Calvary	15:21	27:32	23:26–32
The Crucifixion	15:22–32	27:33–44	23:33–43
The Death of Jesus	15:33–41	27:45–56	23:44–49

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Burial of Jesus	15:42–47	27:57–61	23:50–56
The Guard at the Tomb		27:62–66	

THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE

Mk. 16; Mt. 28; Lk. 24

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Empty Tomb	16:1–8	28:1–10	24:1–11

A. MATTHEW'S CONTINUATION

28:11–20

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Fraud of the High Priests and Elders		28:11–15	
The Revelation of the Risen Christ in Galilee		28:16–20	

B. LUKE'S CONTINUATION

24:13–53

	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
The Emmaus Disciples			24:13–35
The Appearance of Jesus to the Eleven			24:36–49
The Ascension			24:50–53

C. THE LATER CONCLUSION OF MARK

16:9–20

The Gospel according to Mark

Early Tradition about the Gospel

In the second century, this Gospel was ascribed to the "John called Mark," son of the Mary to whose house Peter went after escaping from prison (Acts 12:12) and whom Paul and Barnabas took along as aide on the first missionary journey (Acts 12:25). He was a nephew of Barnabas (Col. 4:10). On crossing from Cyprus to Asia Minor, Mark forsook his companions (Acts 13:13), therewith arousing Paul's ire, as we see from the Apostle's refusal to take him on the second journey. Mark then went with Barnabas to Cyprus (Acts 15:37 f.). A decade later we find him back in Paul's favor (Col. 4:10 f.; Philem. 24), and being sent by him on a mission to Colossae. In the Pastorals, Timothy is told to bring Mark to Paul's place of captivity (2 Tim. 4:11). In 1 Pet. 5:12–13, Mark, endearingly called "my son," is in Babylon (= Rome) in attendance on Peter along with Silvanus (or Silas), also a former helper of Paul. It seems probable that the same individual is meant in all cases. Mark must have been a name he acquired after leaving Palestine. It is a Roman name (Marcus, written *Márkos* in Greek).

The authorship of the Gospel by Mark is first commented on by Papias of Hierapolis in Asia Minor (*c.* A.D. 135), who claims to have known pupils of the Apostles and who speaks of making diligent inquiries of them as to what the Apostles had said. One of them, no doubt the "presbyter" John of Ephesus (see p. 263 f.), was his authority in the following passage:

> Mark who was the interpreter of Peter meticulously wrote down what he remembered, though not in order, of the things Jesus said and did. For he had not heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I stated, (he had followed) Peter, who made his teachings according to needs, but not giving an orderly presentation of the oracles (Gr. *lógia*) of the Lord. So that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down single things, as he remembered them. For he took thought of only one thing: not to leave out any of the things he heard or to say falsely anything in them (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 39).*

We need not stress the function of "interpreter," since what is meant by that term here involves one in futile debate. It is enough to infer that Mark allegedly had a role keeping him in attendance on the Apostle. If he is said to have written down what he *remembered* of Peter's story of Jesus this evidently assumes his writing in retrospect. That inference is supported by Irenaeus (*c.* A.D. 185), who says that Mark, "the interpreter and disciple of Peter," wrote after the deaths of Peter and Paul. The main purpose of the statement of Papias was to put the authority of Peter behind this Gospel. It evidently was under attack on the ground that its author was no Apostle. Papias also alludes to a criticism of a different kind: that Mark did not write down the oracles of the Lord "in order." He excuses him by pointing out that Peter brought forward these materials incidentally.

---

* Translations are by the writer unless otherwise noted.

Another important witness to the Marcan authorship of the Gospel is Clement of Alexandria (*c.* A.D. 200). According to a quotation from him given by Eusebius, Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, while Peter was still living, and received his approval (*Eccl. Hist., 2,* 15). In 1958 a supposed quotation from Clement turned up, copied into the pages of a seventeenth-century book in the monastery of Mar Saba, near Jerusalem. Some monk must have taken it from an earlier source. It bears the title "From the letters of the most holy Clement, the author of the *Stromata,* to Theodore." In replying to that worthy, who had mentioned a secret Gospel allegedly written by Mark that was in possession of the sect of the Carpocratians, Clement charged that their version was falsified, but admits that there was such a secret Gospel—of course in possession of the Alexandrian church, which supposedly was founded by Mark. He states that when Mark had written an account of the Lord's "Acts" while with Peter at Rome, he had not written about all of them, nor had he even hinted "at the ones pertaining to the mysteries." He had made only a selection, choosing those acts that would be "most useful" in instruction in the faith. After Peter's death, Mark had gone to Alexandria, taking along the notes of Peter. From these he "transferred to his former book the things suitable to progress towards knowledge." If this is genuine, as seems probable, and not merely the fancy of a monk, there was a Gnostic version of the Gospel of Mark, which Clement took to be a real second edition by the author. In addition there was esoteric information which Mark had supposedly imparted but which was too sacred to put down in writing. One can see how a belief that the Apostles were custodians of deeper mysteries than were available to the general public could start from Mk. 4:11. Peter as first among the Apostles naturally possessed these in full measure, and Mark who had been close to Peter was thus in a key position to hand them down. So far as Mark's original Gospel is concerned, Clement's tradition gives it the imprimatur of Peter more effectively than that of Papias, but for that reason is less credible.

The Place of Origin

Is the tradition that the Gospel was written at Rome confirmed by any internal criteria? The author writes for Gentiles, because he finds it necessary to explain Jewish customs to them (7:3 f.; 14:12; 15:42). He makes almost no direct use of the Old Testament, probably because he cannot presuppose much knowledge of it. In his view, the gospel is being preached in the whole world (11:17; 13:10; 14:9); he thus belongs within the general orbit of Hellenistic Christianity. There are a number of Latin loan words in his Greek. If he explains in 12:42 that two *leptá* make one *quadrans* this suggests that his readers were unfamiliar with the value of the Greek coin, and accustomed to Roman coinage. There are also Latinisms in his constructions (cf. 14:65; 15:15; 15:19). The mention of the sons of Simon of Cyrene—Alexander and Rufus—indicates that they were known or were of recent memory wherever the Passion narrative was formulated. If one supposes the place to have been Rome, then it is attractive to believe that the Rufus to whom Paul sends greetings (Rom. 16:13) is this same Rufus. His mother was evidently very dear to Paul, and since Paul had not yet visited Rome when he wrote to the Romans, they must have lived previously in the East. All these indications in themselves would not prove Roman origin of the Gospel, but in conjunction with a firm, never-challenged tradition, they carry weight.

We see no reason to exchange that traditional view for a theory of Galilean origin recently proposed by Willi Marxsen (*Der Evangelist Markus,* 1956). The main support for that is an interpretation of Mk. 14:28 and 16:7 as referring to the Second Coming of Christ and as intended for Christians fleeing Jerusalem *c.* A.D. 68.

The Time of Origin

The tradition of Papias held that Mark wrote after the death of Peter. Assuming that Peter died under Nero, as ancient tradition supposes, we get a minimum date of *c.* A.D. 65. The only indications of date in the book itself are given by the apocalypse in ch. 13, which presupposes the siege of Jerusalem that had begun in 68, but was discontinued until A.D. 70, and by 12:9, which seems to presuppose the destruction of the city. If one accepts the tradition of Roman origin of the book, then one might infer that the Roman congregation, destroyed or driven underground in Nero's persecution, could not have been re-established until after that ruler's death on June 9, A.D. 68. From that day to the end of 69 was a time of crisis for Rome, and it may well be that this stimulated Jewish as well as Christian apocalyptic hopes. The latter may have been a factor leading to the production of this Gospel. The dating of *c.* A.D. 70 would remain probable even if the Gospel were written elsewhere than at Rome.

Authorship

If one accepts the traditional claim that Paul's letters to Philemon and the Colossians were written from the captivity in Rome (not from Ephesus or Caesarea), then John Mark was clearly in the Eternal City *c.* A.D. 62–64. If one accepts the authenticity of 1 Peter, then he was in Rome, in close companionship with Peter (after Paul's earlier martyrdom?); if one does not accept 1 Peter as authentic, then one must suppose that early *legend* associated him with Peter at Rome. The tradition of Marcan authorship thus fits in with that of Roman origin of the Gospel. But this does not mean that one must accept Papias' or Clement's idea of how the Gospel was composed. Their claim that Mark wrote down what Peter said limits his source of information unduly. The elements in the Gospel going back to Peter or to persons who knew him must probably be restricted to those units in which he is especially mentioned. Not all of these are dependable, e.g., such a "midrashic" piece as 11:20–21. The bulk of Mark's material was of the kind described in the section on form criticism (see p. 16). Its origin was social, rather than individual.

More serious objections to Marcan authorship can be based on the fact that this writer does not appear to be as well informed about what happened in the Passion week and at Easter as one might expect of a man whose house was a meeting place of an early Christian group (Acts 12:12). The difficulty is increased if one holds that Mark is the youth of 14:51. But that theory may be discounted. Mark must have been a very young man when he went with Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey *c.* A.D. 46 (Acts 13:5), and presumably he would have been only a child in A.D. 29–30. It seems probable that he and his mother left Jerusalem after having harbored the fugitive Peter in A.D. 44 (Acts 12:12). Thus if the Gospel author's knowledge of Jerusalem and of Jewish law and legal procedures seems vague, that still would not preclude his being John Mark.

But one should not insist too strongly on the authorship tradition in view of its apologetic purpose. If the Gospel was written at Rome and could not be ascribed to an Apostle, it was natural to make one who had been close to Peter the author, in order to assure it of standing in the Church. In the situation after the persecution under Nero, the writers of Christian propaganda documents were hardly eager to reveal their identity. Knowledge of the real author, if he were another than Mark, may have perished in the persecution under Domitian in 95 (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 17).

Whoever wrote the Gospel, he was, like Mark, a Near Eastern Jew, for he is able to quote and translate Hebrew or Aramaic words and phrases, and his syntax is full of Semitisms. Some scholars even have contended that the book is translated from the Aramaic. But to establish this, one would have to prove numerous cases of mistranslation, for a few might be applicable only to pieces of source material incorporated. The instances that have been put forward for Mark are, however, unconvincing. But occasionally Aramaic idioms help clarify what the text means. This is to be expected, since the tradition must ultimately have been Aramaic.

Sources of Mark

A few decades ago, scholars believed that the present Gospel had evolved from an earlier Proto-Mark. Underlying this theory was the hope to find a historical Jesus who could be fitted into the category of teacher or prophet. Form criticism destroyed that hope (see p. 15). The problem of the sources of Mark still remains, however, and cannot be entirely ignored.

We will content ourselves here with pointing out some materials which apparently had been linked together before Mark wrote. In the sphere of narrative, the Passion story represents such a cycle. One can see that it has been expanded, but whether that is due to Mark or is pre-Marcan is an open question. The Gospel author no doubt took over the story that was in use where he wrote. Furthermore, there are two cycles that are basically parallel: 6:34–7:37 and 8:1–26, though the second either did not contain or has lost two incidents.

6:34–44	Feeding of the 5,000	8:1–9	Feeding of the 4,000
6:45–52	Walking on the Water		
6:53–56	Lake Crossing (to Gennesareth)	8:10	Lake Crossing to Dalmanutha
7:1–23	Controversy with Pharisees	8:11–12	Controversy with Pharisees
7:24–30	The Syrophoenician Woman		
7:31–37	Healing of a Deaf-Mute in the Decapolis	8:22–26	Healing of a Blind Man at Bethsaida

Whether the author built them up in this manner according to a law of parallelism or received one or both cycles, he neatly tied 6:34 f. and 8:1 f. together in 8:18–20. He thereby shows that he was no longer close enough to the events to be able to recognize that the second story of the feeding of a multitude was only a variant of the first. In the sphere of the words of Jesus, the "little Apocalypse" of ch. 13 is the most probable instance of incorporation of a complete entity. The parables of ch. 4 may also be an excerpt. That Mark derived hortatory, didactical, and prophetic utterances from small collections of sayings such as missionaries may have carried with them also seems probable. It is unlikely that he knew and used Q (see p. 14 f.).

The Theological Profile

The first thing to meet the eye is that Mark puts his book under the ruling idea of "the gospel of Jesus Christ" (1:1). The word "gospel" does not appear in his underlying materials, but only in his own editorial contributions (1:15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9). It is imagined as being preached to the whole world. We are thus in the sphere of Paulinism, for Paul is the chief proponent and perhaps even the originator of this term, as expressive of the Christian message. It is in full accord with Paul's doctrine—and apparently that of the line of Christianity from which his theology sprang (1 Cor. 15:5)—that the death of Christ is viewed as atonement (10:45; 14:26) and that the proclamation of his resurrection is climactic.

The Gospel seeks, among other things, to provide an explanation of how it came that Jesus, who was really Israel's divinely sent Messiah, was rejected by the Jews and crucified. The basic factor was divine predestination, expressed by the little word "must" (Gr. *dei*) in the first Passion announcement (8:31; cf. Lk. 24:26). The meaning is "Christ died according to the Scriptures," and this rested primarily on Is. 53—the "Servant of the Lord" being interpreted as the Messiah. At one point Mark introduces the unnatural idea that Jesus spoke in parables to the people so that he might not be understood, and that they therefore might not be saved from the impending divine judgment (4:11–12). This is inferred from Is. 6:9, though without direct mention of the source. The theory enables Mark to put forward the idea that the disciples received explanation of the meaning of the parables from Jesus, and an example of this is provided in 4:13 f. The fact that the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of God had been given to them exalted their authority, and of course, the authority of those who were the custodians of the information inherited from them.

But the most distinctive single facet in Mark's presentation is the idea that Jesus sought to keep his Messiahship secret. It is recognized only by the demons whom he exorcises, and he sternly forbids them to reveal his identity to men. If Jesus speaks of himself as "Son of man"—a phrase derived from Dan. 7:13—this seems inconsistent with such secrecy, unless one assumes that people did not know what he meant. For Mark's Gentile readers (to whom this term was mystifying), it may have been intriguing that Jesus was declaring himself in this cryptic manner without anybody's appreciating the significance. At certain points the supernatural power or capacity of Jesus shines through the happenings, e.g., in his forgiving sins (2:5), in his commanding wind and waves (4:39), in the feeding of the multitudes (6:41; 8:7), in the walking on the water (7:48), in the Transfiguration (9:2 ff.) and at the healing of the epileptic boy (9:19). Mark has aptly been called the book of the secret manifestations of the divine Sonship of Christ.

The vindication of Jesus as Messiah was fully accomplished for the original Christian group by his resurrection. But the vindication before the world required his return as the Son of man of Dan. 7:13. The problem of the delay in this return had to be faced by all the evangelists. The original apostolic expectation was that he would come before the missionary work in Palestine could be completed (Mt. 10:23). Under the influence of the Hellenists and the group proposing mission among the Gentiles, the idea grew that the gospel "must" first be preached to foreign Jews and to the nations (13:10). In Mark's time, this objective seemed to have been reached, and under the impact of the dramatic world events of A.D. 68–70, he could entertain the possibility that Christ's return was imminent.

The Conclusion of the Gospel

As several of the best manuscripts and remarks of the early Church Fathers show, the Gospel originally ended at 16:8 with the story of the discovery of the empty tomb. Such an ending seemed unsatisfactory, especially when the other three Gospels carried the story further. A shorter and a longer conclusion were supplied —the longer one being that found in the received text and consequently in the A.V. According to a tenth-century Armenian manuscript discovered in a monastery at the foot of Mt. Ararat in 1891, this conclusion of the Gospel goes back to "Ariston the presbyter"—presumably meaning Aristion, a disciple mentioned by Papias (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 39). But analysis shows that this conclusion is no first-rate source material; it is based on the other Gospels. In Codex W there is a remarkable addition after 16:14: the so-called Freer-logion. There is also a shorter conclusion (cf. p. 113), which seems to have originated in Egypt in the fourth century.

MARK

PART I THE GALILEAN PERIOD

1:1–9:50 (Mt. 3–18; Lk. 3:1–9:50)

1:1–6 John the Baptist (Mt. 3:1–6; Lk. 3:1–6). The book opens with two pieces of material, the second of which is difficult to connect grammatically either with the first piece or with the narrative that begins in v. 4. The initial piece is, "Beginning (Gr. *archē*) of the gospel of Jesus Christ [the Son of God]." The second is a scripture-quotation unit, vv. 2–3, introduced by "just as." Then follows the first narrative sentence in v. 4, recording John the Baptist's appearance on the scene.

v. 1 Some regard v. 1 as the title of the *book.* But this requires construing the contents of the whole work or of the history it relates as the beginning of the Gospel—a thing that seems strained and artificial. It seems preferable to take the verse as an intentionally abrupt and nonliterary remark somewhat like that of Hos. 1:2, "Beginning of the word of the Lord to Hosea," which applied only to the initial revelation. One could almost replace the first noun with a verb and render, "Thus begins the gospel of Jesus Christ."

Important Christian terminology is exhibited in these opening words. The term "gospel" or "good tidings" is a designation for the Christian message of salvation (cf. p. 13). Its adoption by Mark is as striking as is its avoidance by Luke and John and the divergent use of it by Matthew. If the word "Christ" appears here without the definite article, that shows that it has become a name and has lost its original meaning (cf. Acts 5:42); "Jesus Christ" sounded natural to Western ears, like Julius Caesar, or Pontius Pilate. The service originally done by name-plus-title (Jesus, the Christ or Messiah) is performed now by two names plus the new title, "Son of God." True, that phrase may not be original in v. 1. It is missing in some important manuscripts and versions, and could have been added to make clear that the reference is not to the gospel preached by Jesus (1:14), but to that *about* him. There can be no question, however, but that it correctly expresses Mark's "Christology" (cf. 3:11).

vv. 2–3 The scripture-quotation unit also ends abruptly. The introductory words, "Just as it is written," are sometimes taken as the beginning of a sentence, which then is continued by v. 4: "(so) John the Baptist came, etc." The R.S.V. suggests that interpretation by using a dash at the end of v. 3. However, "just as" is more naturally construed as explanatory of v. 1: the gospel began, as is written. . . . Since Mark does not otherwise quote Scripture in this direct manner, some scholars have looked upon this unit as an intrusion. Others argue that this quotation is highly essential to the context; that what follows in vv. 4–8 has been deliberately selected to show how the prophecy was fulfilled. While this is subtle, elimination of vv. 2–3 is difficult because both Matthew and Luke copy v. 3, though changing its position, and they even repeat the same variation from the LXX text: "make straight *his paths*" (instead of "make straight the paths of our God"). It thus seems to have stood in their texts of Mark. Mark says that he is quoting from the prophet Isaiah, but actually has prefaced the Isaiah quotation with one from Malachi (3:1). (Hence some manuscripts replace the reference to Isaiah with "in the prophets," an obvious correction.) If Matthew and Luke omit the verse from Malachi, this may not be so much on account of the technical error as owing to the fact that they are going to include a piece from Q, in which this passage is put to important use (Mt. 11:10; Lk. 7:27).

vv. 4–6 Real narration starts here. John the Baptizer (so also 6:14, 24; usually "Baptist") arose (cf. 2 Pet. 2:1) "in the wilderness" (Gr. *érēmos,* adj. "waste," *sc.* "land") "proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Proclaiming (Gr. *kērússein*) suggests announcing important news, such as the special messenger of the Malachi prediction was to bear. What John proclaimed, however—a baptism, or immersion—could never have been guessed from these prophecies. Proclaiming the baptism implies its authoritative institution by God's command. The purpose of undergoing the baptism was to obtain remission or forgiveness of sins. But a precondition for receiving this was repentance. The latter is understood in Old Testament manner, as a turning about from a wrong course and going back toward God and his law.

Did John actually conceive of his rite as conferring forgiveness of sins? The testimony of Josephus about John's ministry is relevant in this connection.

> He commanded the Jews to cultivate virtue by justice towards each other and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for immersion, he said, would only appear acceptable to God if practised not as an expiation for specific offenses, but for purification of the body, when the soul had already been thoroughly cleansed by righteousness (*Ant., 18,* 5, 2).

Here John's baptism is imagined primarily as a purification of the body, as was the case also with Proselyte baptism—an initiation rite which converts to Judaism had to undergo before being fully integrated into the Jewish community, to ensure their being cleansed of all heathen impurities. Could it be that Mark has raised John's baptism to a higher plane than that on which it actually stood? But that seems improbable since the Baptist's followers constituted a rival sect, distinct from the Church. Furthermore, was it not the very claim that forgiveness of sins was received through a repentant undergoing of the baptismal act, which gave John's baptism its power of attracting people from a distance? It requires solid benefits to move humanity. There was, too, a real need for something of this nature. The Jewish cult provided for a national atonement by the ceremonies of the day of Atonement, but the individual had only the recourse of sin-offerings, the efficaciousness of which in his case was not sure. It may thus be that Mark's presentation is to be preferred to that of Josephus, who is prone to write what is pleasing to Hellenistic readers. The Marcan formulation that John proclaimed a baptism is echoed in Acts 10:37, and supported by the saying of Jesus implying that John's baptism was from heaven (Mt. 21:25). The remission of sins is also connected with John in Lk. 1:77. The omission of the phrase by Matthew (3:11) may be due to a desire to put John's baptism on a lower plane than Christian baptism, with which remission of sins was characteristically associated (cf. especially Acts 2:38; 22:16). The Baptist may have viewed his rite as part of the cleansing predicted for the Messianic times (Jn. 1:25; cf. Is. 1:16; 4:4; Ezek. 36:25; Zech. 3:4).

The impact of John's appearance was great. "All the Judaean land and all the Jerusalemites went out to him and were being baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." It seems probable that John required them to repeat some confessional formula such as the one the Qumran community used at the initiation of its members:

> We have acted perversely, we have transgressed, we have sinned, we have done wickedly, both we and our fathers before us, because we have walked contrary to true ordinances, etc.

The place where John carried on his activity is plausibly held by Byzantine tradition to have been near the Jordan ford southeast of Jericho. Mark speaks of baptism *by* John, but perhaps this means no more than "at his behest." Significantly, Codex D in Lk. 3:7 reads "to be baptized *before him*" instead of "by him." The underlying Semitic verb is an intransitive active: "to undergo immersion."

v. 6 Some brief words speak of the life led by John in the wilderness. The description of his garb may have been inferred from 2 Kings 1:8 (though not following the LXX): he wore "camel-hairs" (i.e., a skin with the hairy side out?) and a leather girdle." (Codex D and the Old Latin read "a coat of camel [-skin]" and omit the "leather girdle.") Some scholars think that this has been introduced into the text of Mark from Mt. 3:4. His food is said to have been locusts and wild honey. The latter clearly means bee honey, which was abundant in the Jordan country (Jos., *B. J., 4,* 8). That locusts were eaten as food is already evidenced in Lev. 11:22. Talmudic law prescribes concerning varieties of them that may or may not be eaten. The Damascus document (of which fragments have now turned up at Qumran, and which thus is proved to be ancient Essene) directs that they are to be put alive in fire or water (*12,* 14). Arabs eat them, boiled in salt water or roasted on coals, then dried and pulverized. But the mention of these two items of food, which were hardly available at all times, is evidently impressionistic. They characterize the ascetic as living in a manner independent of shepherd or farmer. The Ebionite Gospel omitted reference to locusts; of the honey John ate, it said "it tasted like manna, like a cake in oil."

1:7–8 John's Preaching concerning the Messiah (Mt. 3:11–12; Lk. 3:15–18; cf. Jn. 1:19–28). Mark is not interested in the Baptist's ethical preaching, as are Matthew and Luke. For him, the Baptist is strictly the forerunner of Jesus, and so this evangelist's concern is with his Messianic prophecy. He proclaimed, saying that one stronger than he would come after (i.e., immediately behind) him, and that he was not worthy to stoop down and untie the thongs of his sandals. "I baptize you with (mere) water, he will baptize you with holy spirit." The Rule of the Community (Manual of Discipline) from Qumran, in an interesting passage describing how two spirits, good and evil, coexist in the world with divine permission until the time of the decreed judgment, predicts that God will at that time refine for himself some of mankind and through a holy spirit will cleanse them of all wicked practices, sprinkling upon them a spirit of truth as purifying water (cf. Is. 32:15; 44:3; Ezek. 36:25, 27; 39:29; Joel 2:28–29, 3:1–2 Heb.). This happens to take the theocratic line; where the agency of the Messiah or a Messianic prophet is stressed, the same thing could be attributed to *his* action. That is the viewpoint of John's words.

1:9–11 The Baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:13–17; Lk. 3:21–22; cf. Jn. 1:29–34). It was evidently a fact which could not be denied that Jesus had been baptized by John, and that some time thereafter he had begun his own ministry. Mark not only admits it but turns it to an advantage. He establishes a transition to the event in Old Testament style with a simple "It came to pass in those days," and then relates that Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee came and was baptized "into" the Jordan by John. Since Mark has described John's baptism as one of repentance for the remission of sins, one might think that he would be troubled by the question of Jesus' undergoing this baptism, as the other evangelists obviously are. It may be that he interpreted his submission to it as an act of humility and that the final v., 11b, is formulated with an apologetic purpose. Since the working of a higher power in and through Jesus was manifest at once in his ministry, it was an excellent supposition that he had received it at the Baptism. The story of that event thus attracted to itself what may be called "the installation motif," and thereby became transformed.

Visionary experiences, coupled with divine communications, had long been connected with installation to office of kings and prophets. Jesus is described as having such a vision when he came out of the water. There could be no actual knowledge of a vision that Jesus may have had. Mark or the traditioners before him reconstructed such a story. It was the expected and appropriate thing from the viewpoint of the ancient readers or hearers. It provided an explanation of how the man who had gone forth from Nazareth as a carpenter (1:9; 6:3) could return as a teacher and wonderworker in whom was the power of God. It counteracted claims of the Baptist's followers that John was greater than

Jesus because he baptized Jesus. The details were drawn from existing lore of folk tale and mythology.

Jesus saw the heavens "rent open" (cf. Is. 64:1, presupposing the idea of a solid "firmament" behind which God dwells, and in which the poet says he should tear a gap and descend again to his people), and "the Spirit" (this absolute use of Spirit sounds Hellenistic; Lk. 3:22 has "the Holy Spirit") descending to him "like a dove" (i.e., in a guise best compared to this familiar bird). The story then speaks of a voice coming from heaven (cf. Dan. 4:31) which, as in 9:7, is that of God himself. Rabbinic tales, too, tell of a heavenly voice uttering some comment, but designate it more cautiously as "the daughter of a voice" (Heb. *bath qōl*) because it is conceived of as only an echo of what God spoke in heaven. Here the voice says, "Thou art my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased (and whom I hence have chosen)." The words are based on Is. 42:1 —but not from the LXX—and Ps. 2:7; "beloved" perhaps being a rendering of "chosen," or else influenced by Gen. 22:2.

The installation motif appears here in combination with the adoption motif. The latter replaces any instruction such as one might expect to be associated with a vision amounting to a call. The old formula of adoption was: "Thou art my son." In Ps. 2:7, where some Judaean king was addressed, the formula was expanded with the words "this day have I begotten thee." These words appear in Codex D and the Old Latin in Luke's parallel passage 3:22, in place of "with whom I am well pleased." But the text of Mark should not be restored on the basis of it. It makes good sense that Mark used the words expressing God's satisfaction with Jesus because they show that the latter did not need the baptism of repentance, which he had undergone. It was a work of supererogation on his part. In an earlier version, however, the thought that Jesus at this occasion became "Son of God" by adoption may have been the real point of the story, and Ps. 2:7 may have been stressed. Mark himself, as the rest of his Gospel shows, can hardly have taken the adoption motif at its full value here. It is, rather, a revelation to Jesus of who he is, and an invitation to exercise his filial right. The allusion to the dove may also have been meaningful in an earlier context. This is a folk-tale motif, which is found in stories of how an individual was designated as the deity's choice for the office of king by a bird descending upon him. It has here been combined with the idea of the Spirit of God, and thus involves also the mythological idea of "metamorphosis" (cf. on 9:2). However, the experience is visionary. No bird attends Jesus in his travels, but the Spirit does, as the next piece immediately shows. Thus Mark has counteracted any assertions to the effect that Jesus was an ordinary mortal, who had confessed his sins in submitting to baptism by John, and was inferior to the latter by accepting and obeying his message. He has turned the Baptism into the occasion when the divine call came to Jesus, along with the gift of the Spirit, without which there could be no success.

1:12–13 The Temptation (cf. Mt. 4:1–11; Lk. 4:1–13). In Mark this could almost be called "The Sojourn of Jesus in the Wilderness." Of Samson it is said that the Spirit of the Lord began to go with him (Judg. 13:25, LXX). In the case of Jesus, the Spirit drove him out into the waste lands. That he remained there forty days was the Spirit's doing. Mark thus gains a lapse of time, which he needed before introducing 1:14. Three brief touches are added to this strange wilderness sojourn of Jesus—he was tempted (repeatedly) by Satan; he was with the wild beasts (a term applying especially to animals that are hunted, but also to serpents; cf. Acts 28:4); and the angels ministered to him (with food and drink). The item about his being tempted by Satan was made central and elaborated on in a different line of tradition, which through Q came into Matthew and Luke. In Mark it has no such importance. To him this is evidently a period of seclusion and preparation on the part of Jesus. To seek such privacy was the expected thing for a man of destiny. Mark or a predecessor may have reconstructed this situation on the basis of biographical analogies. In the legend of Buddha, the latter, too, after his initial revelation, remains sunk in meditation and is tempted by the Evil One (*Mara*). Some have gone so far as to find a relationship between the Buddha legend and the story of Christ's temptation. But it is merely the operation of the same pattern of ancient hagiography that produced both.

1:14–15 Appearance of Jesus in Galilee (Mt. 4:12–17; Lk. 4:14–15). Some vague knowledge existed about Jesus' first preaching activity. Mark, who is influenced by his idea that the Messiah follows on the heels of the forerunner, has Jesus start back to Galilee after John has been handed over (by God into prison). How long the interval actually was between the Baptism of Jesus and that event is obscure. Indeed, the Gospel according to John has a very different tradition, according to which Jesus and John carried on a parallel activity for a time (Jn. 3:22 f.; 4:1 f.). Mark says that Jesus came (back) to Galilee proclaiming the gospel of God (i.e., the good tidings sent by God; cf. Rom. 1:1; 15:16, etc.). He summarizes it as the declaration that the (predestined measure of) time has become full (Gal. 4:4), and that the kingdom of God (implying judgment over the wicked and salvation for the faithful) has come near; [therefore] people should repent and believe in the gospel (= the message as just described).

The kingdom of God is indeed central in the teaching of Jesus, as shown by so many of his sayings and parables, and basically it spelled gladness for the children of God. To describe it as "gospel," however, is probably a case of overlaying a concept of the early Church on the narrative. It is noteworthy, though, that Mark makes an effort to present the message of Jesus historically; the gospel he refers to here is not yet the gospel of Jesus Christ of which he spoke in 1:1, but rather what Matthew terms "the gospel of the kingdom" (4:23; 9:35). In the command "to believe in the gospel," one may also detect Christian formulation. This may well be an explanatory addition by Mark, but it is quite pertinent. He here plants an idea that is important in so many coming incidents. In any case, faith in what Jesus proclaimed was required, and that in turn implied faith in his person as sent by God.

Mark can report nothing about an itinerary of Jesus, or even a visit to Nazareth, such as Luke has reconstructed in Lk. 4:16–30. The next item that he is able to adduce is that of the call of disciples. From that point on we encounter real knowledge of what Jesus said and did—obvious proof of the fact that tradition emanating from the Apostles underlies much that he adduces. Before that point he had to build his narrative as best he could out of a few bare facts and a number of suppositions which the hagiography of the age suggested and colored.

1:16–20 The Call of the First Disciples (Mt. 4:18–22; cf. Lk. 5:1–11). This is not yet a traditional story of the typical brief kind, for it contains no complication. There is contained in it only a saying of Jesus with a situation description. Mark may have reconstructed the latter from the saying itself. Jesus is walking by the sea of Galilee, but how he came to be there is not related. He sees Simon (Hellenized name-form; the more original "Symeon" is used only in 1 Pet. 1:1) and Andrew (Andreas; Gr. name, "the manly one") here identified as Simon's brother (hence not so well remembered), throwing the cast net. Mark adds an explanation that they were (professional) fishermen. After the manner of an Old Testament prophet (2 Kings 6:19), Jesus bids them follow him (as his disciples), and says he will make them *become* "fishers of men." Mark continues this by relating the call of two other men who played a role of prime importance in the Primitive Church, the brothers James and John, sons of Zebedee, whom Jesus finds mending nets. He invites them, and they leave their father in the boat with the hired men (and hence not forsaken of aid) and follow him. What Jesus said to them, however, was not handed down. In view of their early deaths (Acts 12:2; and cf. p. 265) this is not surprising. One cannot be sure that these two calls took place on the same day, or that James and John were not called first. The Ebionite Gospel gave them the precedence (cf. also the entirely different tradition of Jn. 1:35 f.). The version putting Peter first came from his adherents. The request of the sons of Zebedee (10:35 f.) becomes more comprehensible if they were the first.

1:21–28 Jesus in the Synagogue at Capernaum (Lk. 4:31–37; cf. Mt. 7:28–29). Here we meet the first brief story of the shorter type, which existed as an independent anecdote prior to its reception by Mark. It was related as the main incident attending Jesus' coming to Capernaum. Mark has connected it with the calling of the disciples and with the events that follow in vv. 29–38 and has thereby given the impression that he is describing the opening day of Jesus' self-manifestation to men. It was an excellent idea, but one must not be deceived that we here have an eyewitness account of Peter or some other participant. Under such assumption one is quickly beset by difficulties. One gets the impression that the Sabbath had begun by the time Jesus and his companions came to Capernaum and that they immediately went to the synagogue. After the service (1:29) Jesus then is taken to the house of the first pair of disciples. This is perplexing, for the Sabbath starts at sunset, and the sun does not set until v. 32, where, furthermore, the natural inference is that a Sabbath is *ending*. According to rabbinic sources there was no service at the beginning of a Sabbath, but only on the following afternoon. However, if Jesus had arrived on a Sabbath afternoon, coming more than a Sabbath's journey (Acts 1:12), he would have been violating the Sabbath, as would the fishermen by engaging in their occupation. It becomes apparent, therefore, that Mark's day in Capernaum is an artificial construction. One can analyze the separate units, but it is impossible to say in what order they actually took place. Luke, we may note, escapes difficulties by omitting the call of the disciples and their coming to Capernaum with Jesus. The latter goes alone from Nazareth to Capernaum and teaches on the next Sabbath (Lk. 4:31 f.).

The description of the synagogue service is purely typical (cf. Lk. 4:16 ff. concerning such occasions). The people were amazed at the teaching of Jesus, for he taught as one having power (from on high) and not as the scribes. (Matthew, who omits the story, uses this item at the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, 7:28–29.)

With this service is linked the incident of the healing of a man with an unclean spirit. It provides proof that Jesus really had power from above. However, the connection between the healing and the service could be artificial; the healing incident may have occurred at a different occasion entirely. It seems doubtful whether a demoniac was admitted to a synagogue service. Matthew's omission of this story may hang together with better knowledge on this point.

The belief in demon possession is very vivid in Mark's Gospel. The terminology used includes both "unclean spirit," as here, and demon (cf. 1:34). The terms are interchangeable (cf. 7:25, 26). "Unclean spirit" is a rendering of the Semitic phrase "spirit of uncleanness" (cf. Zech. 13:2), which is sometimes used for such a spirit in rabbinic texts. Demon, on the other hand, is a rendering of Heb. *shēd* or Aram. *shēdā* (a word derived from the Babylonian *shēdu*) and commonly found in this sense in rabbinic texts and in Eastern Aramaic literature. (The Babylonian *shēdu*, however, was not an evil spirit; in the Old Testament the word *"shēd"* is used in Deut. 32:17 and Ps. 106:37 for pagan gods, but is translated "demon" in the LXX.) Demonology and the technique of driving out demons by magic were highly developed in Babylonia and Assyria, and evidently had spread from there to Palestine in the Persian and Hellenistic eras. By linking the demons with the Devil and his hosts ("Belial and his hosts" in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as in Pseudepigraphic literature) a whole kingdom of evil was set up over against God and the angels. The common man experienced the activity of demons chiefly in illness. He believed that a demon could enter into him and take control of him and even speak out of his mouth.

At this occasion the demon, on hearing the preaching of Jesus, cries out: "What have we (demons) to do with thee, O Jesus, Nazarene? Thou art come to destroy us. I know thee who thou art (= I know you well. You are) the Holy one of God!" (i.e., one set apart from men; cf. Jn. 6:69; the title is given to Aaron in Ps. 106:16). Jesus now "rebukes" (i.e., speaks sternly to) the demon and "silences" him (with respect to revealing his identity) and commands him to "go out." (Some of this phraseology is also found in non-Christian, Hellenistic exorcism stories.) The spirit thereupon throws the man (into a fit?), gives a loud cry, and goes forth from him. That the demons recognize Jesus as the Son of God and that he (unsuccessfully) seeks to prevent such utterances (cf. 1:34; 3:11; 5:7) strikes the reader as odd. We note here a trend that runs through Mark—that Jesus was supposedly trying to keep his Messiahship secret until men came to believe it of themselves.

Presumably it required schizophrenia to be able to speak as a demon. Illnesses attended by nervous disorders were the ones chiefly attributed to demon possession; some illnesses were not so interpreted (cf. 1:32, 34). The thing evidently had a terrible reality for people. Mark believed in an organized kingdom of evil of which the demons were the lower echelons. In representing Jesus as engaging in the driving out of demons (cf. further on 3:22 ff.), Mark shows him victoriously battling the realm of Satan. That the demons would be overcome in the Messianic Age was widely believed and explains why Mark is fond of exorcism stories. Jesus himself must have accepted the existence of demons, for one cannot very well imagine him as only pretending to do so. Indeed, in this period the belief in demons spread abroad in the Hellenistic world—even a man like Plutarch (b. A.D. 46) accepted it. But everybody could certainly hear the the demons crying out, and so the secret is being given away. Mark is apparently trying to carry through the two ideas of the demons recognizing and proclaiming Jesus and of no one else recognizing him, without being aware that this creates confusion. There is, however, one solution of the difficulty which should not be overlooked: perhaps the speaking of demons was imagined as a kind of gibberish which Jesus alone understood. But, if so, Mark has failed to make that plain.

Confronted with this demonstration of wonder-working, the people were amazed so that they were disputing with one another: "What is this? A new teaching with power? (Cf. v. 22. The text varies considerably in the manuscripts. Perhaps originally: What is this teaching with power?) And he (even) commands the unclean spirits and they obey him!" This is the chorus type of conclusion of the brief kind of story. The twofold comment is the result of the fusion of the two incidents—the preaching and the healing. The reference to unclean spirits sounds as though Jesus had already performed other exorcisms. In conclusion Mark then adds to the received tale that the news of this healing spread quickly through the environment (i.e., Galilee; Mt. 4:24, using this, though omitting the miracle, has the report about him go through "all Syria").

1:29–31 The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law (Mt. 8:14–15; Lk. 4:38–39). With the synagogue story and healing incident, Mark connects Jesus' going to the "house of Simon and Andrew" with James and John. That this is an artificially constructed sequence was evidently clear to Matthew, who felt at liberty to change it. The inclusion of Andrew in the house ownership is a bit obscure; Matthew simplifies by making it the house of Peter. That James and John go along is probably due to Mark's desire to maintain the continuity of the incidents that began with 1:16 ff. and to indicate that this pair, too, followed Jesus everywhere. Mark cannot be too one-sidedly partial to Peter; the sons of Zebedee still had protagonists in the Church.

The first arrival at this house is marked by the healing of Simon's mother-in-law. She was sick with the fever—apparently not an illness associated with demons in the Jewish mind (though in old Mesopotamian lore the fever demon is one of the most important). That "they (Simon and his companions?) immediately spoke to him concerning her" implied a request to help her (cf. Lk. 4:38). Drawing near (where she lay) Jesus took her by the hand and raised her up (cf. Luke's more detailed description), and she waited on them (at table). This narrative is not a typical self-contained story, for it lacks the usual point of imparting some significant saying. However, it is closely joined to what follows, and since it is the occasion of Jesus' departure from Capernaum, it has inherent plausibility. It may well have been the first miracle done by Jesus (in view of the artificial placement of 1:23 f.). If Matthew puts this incident at a later juncture (Mt. 8:14 f.; cf. 4:13) that is chiefly because of his desire to group miracle stories together.

1:32–34 Healings at Eventide (Lk. 4:40–41; cf. Mt. 8:16–17). The real point of the whole narrative of the day in Capernaum, starting with the call of the disciples, lies in this section. After sundown (the Sabbath being over), as the news of this healing of Simon's mother-in-law spread, "the whole city" assembled at the door. Many sick were brought, and Jesus healed them. He also exorcised demons (after the manner already described in vv. 23 ff.), not permitting them to speak at all, because they knew him; he wished his identity (as Son of God) to remain concealed. This is a first "summary report," though restricted to the evening of one day.

1:35–38 Departure from Capernaum (Lk. 4:42–43). Mark then relates that Jesus arose early while it was dark and went to a "desert place" (6:31) to pray. Very little mention is otherwise made by Mark of Jesus' praying, aside from giving thanks for food (6:46; 14:35). Early morning prayer enjoyed favor among the Jews in view of the promise given it in Pss. 5:4 and 88:14. No special occasion for this prayer of Jesus is reported, but its mention serves to give the impression of humility and piety, and prevents any thought that his wonder-working was magical or done for his own aggrandizement. His going forth also has an additional purpose; he is seeking to leave Capernaum without being followed. Mark wishes to make it appear that he stayed there only one night (but cf. Mt. 4:13). "Simon and his companions" pursue him, find him, and inform him that people are already seeking him. Jesus wants to go on with them to the neighboring good-sized towns (of which Chorazin was perhaps the nearest) to proclaim (the gospel of 1:15) because it was for that purpose that he had come forth (from God). The latter remark suggests Christological thinking of the Primitive Church; a more plausible formulation for the standpoint of Jesus is that of "being sent" (Lk. 4:43). Apparently without so much as returning to the house, they start off on a journey.

This material is not a self-contained story. It is transitional narration by Mark himself, who has to do justice to the known fact that Jesus had traveled about widely in Galilee, and has to get him away from Capernaum without his being followed by too many people. In some way, however, the four disciples acquired thus far by Jesus must be taken along. Mark could have composed this section himself, or he may have had some reports or traditions to go by.

1:39 Itinerant Preaching in Galilee (Mt. 4:23–25; Lk. 4:44). The Galilean journey is described in very general terms. Information about it was vague—a fact which casts doubt on the actual participation in it of Simon and his companions (note, too, that these are not mentioned in 2:1). Jesus spoke in synagogues (on Sabbaths) and drove demons out of people who were possessed of them. Matthew is the only one to go into greater detail here.

1:40–45 The Healing of a Leper (Mt. 8:1–4; Lk. 5:12–16). To enrich the meager account of the preaching tour of v. 39, Mark adduces a single healing incident. Actually it is a separate story which he puts here editorially. Furthermore, it is not really a story of the brief type but belongs, rather, to the category of the more elaborate ones. A leper comes to Jesus (who is imagined as in a house, cf. v. 45), beseeching him, kneeling and saying that he can cleanse him (i.e., cure him of the disease that made him ritually unclean according to Jewish law). The reaction of Jesus in v. 41 is given in two versions in the manuscripts. According to the most important manuscripts, Jesus was "filled with wrath," while Codex D and other lesser authorities have "was moved with compassion." The former reading as the more difficult deserves preference, and it receives confirmation from the attitude shown in v. 43. It seems probable that this story has undergone considerable evolution and that an original element accounting for the anger of Jesus has dropped out. Jesus stretches forth his hand and touches the leper, and says, "I so will. Be cleansed." (Perhaps the storyteller erred here, under compulsion of the idea of healing by laying on of hands, for Jesus would have defiled himself by such contact. According to Talmudic rules even passing by a leper was defiling. The Old Testament prophet in a like situation was expected to make no more than a gesture of some kind over the diseased part of the body, 2 Kings 5:11). After offering this word of healing, Jesus spoke angrily to the man and drove him off. Unexpectedly, a further saying of Jesus is added in v. 44. It is a rather artificial combination of two elements: (1) the command of silence concerning the healing, which supports Jesus' supposed effort to keep the healing by him secret; (2) the command to show himself to the priest. This second element, however, is not inconsistent with the first, for the man was under no obligation to say that Jesus had cured him of the disease. He had to show himself to a priest (as was also required in the diagnosis of his disease, Lev. 13:1 f.) —meaning wherever one could be found—and when certified as clean by such a one, to take the final step, which Jesus indicates with the words "bring (as offering) for thy cleansing what Moses has commanded (Lev. 14:11 ff.) for a testimony to them" (i.e., to the public in general that he is now cured).

Since v. 44 comes in so belatedly after the man has been driven off, it appears that the original story has been expanded by someone who was bent on showing that Jesus strongly supported obedience to the law of Moses. It seems probable, however, that prior to that expansion Jesus gave the command of silence to the man before driving him off, for v. 45 describes how the man went out and began to proclaim much and spread the word (i.e., the story of his healing). (There was thus no thought of his taking time out to go to a priest, much less to go on a Jerusalem pilgrimage.) The result was that Jesus could not enter a city openly, but had to linger in "waste places" (1:35). Even there he was sought out by people from all sides.

In a fragmentary unknown Gospel dating from *c.* A.D. 150, first edited in 1935 from a papyrus (called Egerton *2*) in the British Museum, the following incident occurs:

> And behold a leper approached him and said, "Teacher Jesus, when I was traveling with lepers and eating with them at the inn (Gr. *pandocheíon*), I became leprous myself also. If, therefore, thou wilt, I shall be cleansed. Then the Lord said "I will: be clean." And at once the leprosy departed from him.

A further saying of the Lord then followed, but whether it ordered him to show himself to the priests, as some scholars would restore the text, is uncertain, for only a few letters remain. The story is not directly dependent on the one in Mark, but evidently came out of parallel tradition concerning the same incident. (It could perhaps explain the anger of Jesus in v. 41 that the man had violated the injunction against association with lepers by traveling with them.)

2:1–12 The Healing of a Paralytic (Mt. 9:1–8; Lk. 5:17–26). A series of five incidents extending through 3:6 shows Jesus in conflict with the Pharisees. An antithesis in teaching was already indicated in 1:22. The first of these incidents is related in a narrative of the short type. In introducing it Mark brings Jesus back (alone?) to Capernaum "after (some) days." He practically restores the situation that existed before Jesus left: he is in the house (of Peter?), and many people come, so that even the space at the doorway is crowded. Jesus is speaking "the word" (cf. 4:33; 8:32, in the technical sense of the message, as in Luke). In 1:35 f. he was entirely engaged in healing, whereas here he is primarily the teacher. But all this is only setting the stage for the healing incident.

Four men bearing a paralytic on his bed were unable to reach Jesus on account of the crowd. "They uncovered the roof" (which no doubt consisted merely of branches laid over crosspoles and covered with earth, lime, and straw, as in Palestinian peasant houses of more recent times). Rather superfluously, one then hears that they dug (a hole) through it (though this is missing in Codices D and W and the Old Latin). Either an error exists in the statement "they uncovered the roof" (for "they carried him or raised him to the roof"—a thing that ought to be mentioned in any case) or two versions of what they did have been combined. There are rabbinic parallels for the expression "dig through" (notably in a story that considers the possibility of lowering a coffin through the roof because it was too big to go through the door). The action, however, is difficult to understand, because it certainly required the consent of the owner of the house and because those inside it would, to say the least, be inconvenienced by the disturbance and by falling dirt and twigs.

However that may be, the narrative asserts that the bearers lowered the bed on which the paralytic lay through the opening they had made, and thus brought him into the presence of Jesus. Seeing their faith, Jesus said to the man "Child, thy sins are forgiven thee." (On "child" as a kindly, intimate mode of addressing a person, cf. 10:24; Mt. 9:2.) That Jesus gives him absolution (and without confession) is surprising. One must of course bear in mind the belief so ingrained in the ancient mind, especially that of the Jews, that suffering is due to sin. But in no other healing episode does Jesus declare such forgiveness. One must assume, therefore, that the statement is made here with an eye to provoking the opposition of certain persons. Some scribes in the audience (unordained ones, who were sent out to rural congregations to give people instruction) regarded this as blasphemy (deserving stoning to death, Lev. 24:15 f.). Jewish teaching held that God alone can forgive sins. Jesus knew "in his spirit"—a Hellenistic conception—what they were thinking (cf. Jn. 2:25) and asked them: "Which is easier: to forgive sins or to heal?"

The continuation in v. 10 is peculiar: "But in order that you may know that the Son of man has power (Gr. *exousía*) on earth to forgive sins," he said to the paralytic, "I say to thee, etc." How shall one explain that incomplete sentence in v. 10a? Some regard the whole of v. 10 as quoted directly from the lips of a Christian preacher like Peter; the words "that you may know," etc., were then addressed to those to whom he was telling the story and were not spoken by Jesus to the scribes. But it seems more probable that the author thinks of v. 10a as intended for the latter. The unfinished sentence then merely indicates the swift changeover, as Jesus turns from the scribes to the paralytic. He bids the invalid to take up his bed and go to his house. The man obeys and goes forth (from the house) before all of them. The story ends with the chorus of those who witnessed the event: they were all astonished and praised God, saying, "We have never seen anything like it" (cf. Mt. 9:33).

The central element in the story as we now read it is the act of forgiveness of sins. It is here associated with use of the "Son of man" title. While "son of man" is a common Aramaic phrase for "man" (cf. 3:28), it can hardly be meant in that sense here, for Jesus would certainly not have taught such a humanistic doctrine as the one that any man can forgive sins. The phrase "Son of man" took on a specialized meaning, within a religious frame of reference, on the basis of Dan. 7:13, where "one like a son of man" (= a man) comes from heaven. "Son of man" thus became a title for an apocalyptic personage. If Jesus called himself the Son of man, he considered himself to be this heavenly figure. It is fully possible that he identified the expected Messiah with the Son of man. However, if he spoke in this manner he was certainly not trying to keep his Messiahship secret. Is Mark just mechanically including material at variance with this viewpoint, and showing Jesus as openly declaring his identity with the Son of man? Or is Jesus applying "Son of man" to himself as a cryptic designation, which his hearers supposedly do not understand? Or shall we conclude that wherever Jesus calls himself "Son of man" this is due to the pious Christian narrator using a favorite title given Jesus in the theology of the Primitive Church? (Cf. further on 8:38.)

If Jesus spoke the forgiveness saying to the paralytic, he must have used a simple "I." Asserting the power to forgive, however, is something unusual. It is a fixed belief that only God forgives sin. Nowhere in any rabbinic text is such a thing attributed to the Messiah. It would seem that it was held in the Primitive Church that Jesus had in certain cases acted with godlike prerogative and had forgiven sin (cf. also Lk. 7:36–50). That is not surprising since he is at times described as acting in place of God (cf. 13:26–27). This story has been molded to its present form in the light of this conception. It is quite possible that vv. 5b–10a represent a Christian addition, and that originally faith and healing were the governing factors in this episode. The concluding chorus stresses only the healing. However, from the point of view of the Church, the story was made much more valuable by this addition, for it now carried a meaning for the Christian readers: God forgives through the living Christ. Under Jewish presuppositions God's forgiveness was an uncertain matter, but the fact that Jesus had forgiven sins on earth gave certainty of forgiveness in heaven.

2:13–17 The Call of Levi and Association with Publicans (Mt. 9:9–13; Lk. 5:27–32). With a transitional verse telling of Jesus' going forth by the side of the lake and teaching, Mark keeps the reader aware of the larger aspects of Jesus' ministry. He then introduces an originally independent story of the briefer kind. It does not fit in smoothly. "Going past (cf. Jn. 9:1) he saw Levi (Codex D and Old Latin: James) son of Alpheus, sitting at the toll-booth." Persons collecting tolls and taxes, usually the underlings of one who had this concession from the government, were called *publicani* in Latin, hence the word "publicans." They were hated because they were regarded as grafters, and because they had much contact with heathen. Shall one suppose that Levi's booth was by the lakeside? Was it after Jesus finished his teaching and was returning to town or before he began it that he saw Levi? One cannot say. The incident may have taken place in the town or at a boundary line, for all we know. The anecdote evidently was handed down with that introduction, and is meager in itself. Jesus simply summons Levi to follow (cf. 1:16), which Levi does.

The continuation is not very clear. It seems artificial that the man follows Jesus, and that in the next verse (v. 15) Jesus is dining with a group of publicans and sinners (the latter being persons with similar discreditable occupations or personally of ill-repute) "at his house." Is this Levi's house (cf. Lk. 5:29)? If one assumes that it is the house of Peter or a house occupied by Jesus himself, the situation becomes still more unrealistic; how would these persons have entertained a crowd? The mention of the disciples as present at the occasion with Jesus is enriched with a commentary: "for there were many that followed him"; this would seem to indicate that not just the four of 1:16 f. were present, but a great many more. Mark is either indicating that the following of Jesus was growing or preparing the way for the selection of the twelve disciples out of a larger number (3:13 ff.).

The "scribes of the Pharisees" (the biblical scholars of the Pharisaic party), seeing Jesus eating with publicans and sinners, allegedly voiced their dissatisfaction to the disciples. But if the disciples were in the banqueting party in a house, how shall one imagine the scribes as able to speak with them? It seems likely that Mark has artificially staged this big dinner on the basis of inference from the eyebrow-lifting question of the scribes, "With the publicans and sinners he eats?" That comment per se requires no banquet. It could have been made on the basis of one or more occasions in which Jesus was seen associating with a publican or a sinner. "Eating" is merely stressed as the element in the situation giving the greatest offense to Pharisees, owing to the laws of clean and unclean. Jesus overhears the remark of his detractors and parries it with a proverbial type of saying: "Not do the strong have need of the physician, but rather the sick." To underline this and to round out the story more effectively, the early traditioners probably added the saying, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." In the latter words Jesus is the one who calls or invites, not Levi. It was thus not formulated for the occasion described in the story. The entire piece has evidently been compiled through fusion of diverse materials. The incident of Levi's calling may have been separate, but have seemed too slight in content to stand by itself. The Pharisaic jibe of v. 16 furnished the stimulus for telling of a banquet, and giving the whole thing its point in a saying of Jesus.

2:18–22 The Question about Fasting (Mt. 9:14–17; Lk. 5:33–39). Significantly, Mark introduces the question about fasting after the banquet story (cf. Mt. 11:18 f.). It has the form of a brief account of a question asked of Jesus and an answer given by him, and is a typical brief narrative. The answer was expanded with several further sayings, either prior to Mark or by Mark. The initial sentence (v. 18a) about the disciples of John and the Pharisees fasting gives the reader the situation, but it is Mark's inference from the received material; it is missing in Matthew and Luke. The tradition itself began with v. 18b "They (indefinite subject) come to Jesus and say to him: why do the disciples of John and the (disciples of the) Pharisees fast while thy disciples do not fast?" The allusion to "disciples of" the Pharisees is not original and is not contained in Mark's introductory sentence; it was evidently added to counterbalance "disciples of John." The Pharisees as such had no disciples—only their scribes did. But more than that—it is probable that "the Pharisees" were added by Mark himself to the received tradition, partly to reduce the antithesis to the disciples of John, and partly with an eye to the appended Sayings of vv. 21–22, which seemed to him aimed at them. The question had nothing to do with fasts ordered by Old Testament law, which Jesus and his disciples certainly observed, but rather with extra fasts performed as good works (cf. Lk. 18:12). Jesus took a negative position on this, for he looked upon fasting as an expression of mourning (cf. Lev. 16:29 ff.). He asked the counterquestion: "Can the 'sons of the bridal-chamber' (i.e., the attendants of the groom) fast while the bridegroom is with them?" This is underlined by repetition in positive form (though omitted in Codex D and the Old Latin). Jesus thereupon declares that days will come when the bridegroom (= the Messiah, Jesus) is taken away; then they will fast "on that day."

Predictions in these narratives, except where they concern apocalyptic matters, are invariably formulated in the light of what has meanwhile come to pass. When this was formulated, Jesus was no longer with his disciples, and they regarded him as the Messiah, for whom the bridegroom symbolism was appropriate. The historical background of this is that while Jesus and his disciples did not fast, fasting was reintroduced in the Primitive Church (cf. Acts 13:3; 14:23), and then justified with this supposed saying of Jesus. The changed mood makes that fully understandable—even if the influence of Pharisaic elements that came into the Church (cf. Acts 15:5) may have had a role in this retrograde movement. The emphasis on fasting "on that day" (not found in parallels) may reflect Friday fasting, in commemoration of Good Friday. It first appears on the scene in Rome, a fact which is of interest in connection with the reports that Mark wrote the Gospel there. It is not possible to delete vv. 19b–20 from the passage in the hope of regaining the original saying of Jesus, for v. 19a uses the Messianic symbolism and implies that the presence of the bridegroom will have an end. The real saying of Jesus in reply to the question has evidently been replaced by one more expressive of the early Christian standpoint.

vv. 21–22 Two other sayings, at first sight unrelated, are appended here: (1) No one sews a patch of "unfulled" (hence unbleached) cloth on an old garment (to cover up a rent). If he does so, the "filling" (unique use of Gr. *plērōma*) tears off from it [the new from the old] and a worse rent appears. The bracketed words are probably an interpretative addition. The saying reflects the poverty of peasant life in Palestine. (2) No one puts new wine (i.e., juice still fermenting) into old skins (i.e., containers for liquids made from skins sewn at the openings). If he does, it will burst them, and both are destroyed. He puts new wine in new skins. (The latter saying, however, is omitted in Codex D and Old Latin texts.) Jesus here emphasizes the newness of his teaching (cf. 1:27) and rejects combining old and new. This radicalism surprises the reader—the more since Jesus makes no effort to create new forms. The same inconsistency appears in Paul. The trend to emphasize the newness of Christianity erupts in Marcion. While vv. 21–22 have no clear relationship with the question about fasting, they are in line with the thought of Jesus' rejection of mournful piety.

2:23–28 Plucking Grain on the Sabbath (Mt. 12:1–8; Lk. 6:1–5). This brief story was handed down separately. It came to pass that Jesus was going through fields of standing grain on a Sabbath, and the disciples plucked ears of grain (rubbing them in their hands to eat the kernels). This must have been around the middle of May. According to Pharisaic interpretation, the commandment against harvesting on the Sabbath (Ex. 34:21, Deut. 23:26) forbade this. (Taking grain in this manner did not, however, count as theft; cf. Deut. 23:25.) Jesus, who himself had taken nothing, defended the disciples with the story of David (1 Sam. 21:1–6). It is a minor slip that Mark or a copyist confused Abiathar and Ahimelech (1 Sam. 22:20. The name is omitted in Codex D, Old Latin, and Old Syriac as well as by Matthew and Luke). A difficulty is caused, however, by the fact that the Old Testament does not mention that this took place on a Sabbath. Jesus must here be depending on a Jewish legendary version of the incident. He argues that David's transgression of the law was excusable because of hunger.

vv. 27–28 An additional saying is then appended, introduced by a new formula: "He said to them." The proposition is here set forth that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. The natural conclusion to be drawn is that the institution should be used intelligently and not be allowed to become a burden; this could be expressed in the words *"Man* is lord also of the Sabbath." (The little word rendered "also" is important for discernment of the connection between v. 27 and v. 28.) It has been suggested, therefore, that the phrase "Son of man," which as we saw in 2:10 originally meant just "man," should be so translated here. But if that were the case, it ought also to have been used in v. 27. The phrase, therefore, is meant here as a title for Jesus. The basic idea that "man" is required here is, however, correct. One may assume that that was the original form of the saying, but that since this liberal conclusion was too disturbing to pharisaically minded Jewish Christians, the slight change was made to *Son* of man—presumably by traditioners previous to Mark. That Jesus could by virtue of his authority set aside Sabbath laws on occasion could be readily granted, without opening the door to others to do as they pleased. Whether Jesus would have thought that man is lord of the Sabbath may be questioned. This sounds like a Hellenistic contribution to the tradition.

3:1–6 The Healing of the Withered Hand (Mt. 12:9–14; Lk. 6:6–11). Another originally independent story of the brief type is introduced by Mark as a fifth incident illustrating the clash between the Pharisees and Jesus. The initial statement, "He *again* entered into a synagogue," suggests that Mark is thinking of a previous synagogue miracle (cf. 1:21 f.). A man with a "withered hand was present." "They (impersonal, but meaning the Pharisees) watched to see if he would heal the man, so that they might bring charges against him (as Sabbath violator)." That Jesus taught at the service is taken for granted, and therefore not mentioned. No doubt it was after his discourse that he invited the sufferer to arise (and step) into the center of the hall. Addressing his adversaries he asks them whether it is (not more) permissible to do good on the Sabbath than to do evil, to save life than to kill? But those thus questioned did not commit themselves. Jesus, looking around at them in wrath, at the same time sorrowful at the hardening of their hearts (here viewed as sin for which they are responsible), commanded the man to stretch forth his hand. He did so and his hand was restored. The Pharisees (realizing the impossibility of preferring charges in the synagogue) now immediately went forth and took counsel with the Herodians (apparently the henchmen of Herod Antipas) as to how they might destroy Jesus.

This conclusion probably is not part of the traditional story, but is Mark's own contribution. He thereby skillfully plants the idea that Jesus was to become the victim of conspiracy. (He brings the two in again in 12:13.) The self-contained story must have ended with the healing. It differs from other healing naratives in that it pays no attention whatsoever to the attitude of the man with the withered hand, whether before or after the healing, and has no chorus-type conclusion. The whole point of the story lies in Jesus' words on the Sabbath. The healing is not reported for its own sake, but to provide the background for the saying.

Thus, by means of five incidents, Mark shows how the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees arose and grew. From the viewpoint of the latter, his presumption in forgiving sins and his laxity (1) in associating with sinners, (2) in the matter of fasting, and (3) with respect to the Sabbath laws—of which two instances are given—brought this about.

3:7–12 Jesus Heals the Crowds (Mt. 12:15–21; Lk. 6:17–19)

vv. 7–9 Mark provides some connecting narrative. He has Jesus withdraw to the lake with his disciples (which seems to assume that he was previously at a distance from it). A great crowd of people from Galilee followed. Mark expands this, having people who heard what Jesus did come also from Judaea, from Jerusalem, from Idumaea, from the other side of the Jordan, and from rural regions of Phoenicia ("Tyre and Sidon"). John the Baptist drew crowds from all Judaea and Jerusalem (1:5), but the miracle-working of Jesus brought people from all the territories belonging in any sense to the Jewish sphere of interest. The mention of Phoenicia, which seems strange at first glance, evidently is to prepare the reader for 7:24 ff. The omission of Samaria is particularly noticeable in view of the inclusion of Idumaea and Phoenicia.

In view of the arrival of such crowds, Jesus told his disciples to have a boat in readiness for him, in order to be able to escape their presence. Presumably Mark is generalizing here, preparatory to giving a specific instance of such use of the boat in 4:1. We are to imagine that Jesus was often forced to do that.

vv. 10–12 A summary report of Jesus' healing activity, like the one in 1:32–34 (cf. also 6:54–56), is then given. The problem created by the pressure of the crowd is explained as due to his having healed so many that the crowd literally "fell upon him that they might touch him" (in superstitious belief of being able by such contact to draw on the power latent in him). The demons (controlling diseased persons compelled them, so that they) fell down before him and cried out, "Thou art the Son of God" (increased clarity over against 1:24). These infernal beings alone recognized his true nature; Jesus threatens the demons exceedingly, that they should not make him known (cf. 1:25; 1:34). With this report Mark then gives an impression of the extensive activity of Jesus and therewith closes a first phase of his ministry.

3:13–19 The Election of the Twelve (Mt. 10:1–4; Lk. 6:12–16; cf. Acts 1:13)

vv. 13–15 Mark again provides a narrative link, but this time only to lead into a list of the twelve disciples. (Matthew simply gives it as a list in connection with the sending out of the Twelve in ch. 10.) Jesus—no doubt from the plain at the shore of the lake—went up the mountain (R.S.V.: "into the hills") and called to him (by messenger? or by voice?) those whom he wished, and they went away (from the crowd) to him. He then "made" (appointed, cf. 1 Sam. 12:6, LXX) twelve, in order that they might be with him (as companions) and that he might send them forth to preach and with power to cast out demons (v. 14). The "sending forth" prepares the reader for 6:7–13.

vv. 16–19 The repetitious statement of v. 16, "He appointed the Twelve" (cf. v. 14), raises a critical question, but the fact that this is missing in Codices A and D and in the Sinaitic Syriac seems to forbid relying too firmly on its originality. The list that then follows is arranged in such a manner that the first and the last name are isolated, while the rest are paired. Simon stands first, separated from his brother by the pair that follows. Jesus is said to have named him Peter. The name "Cephas," by which he was known in his Jerusalem days and even after that (Gal. 2 and 1 Cor. 1:12), is lost sight of. Mark may believe "Peter" to be a translation of Cephas (cf. p. 158). Such name-giving always presupposes an explanatory incident. Mark evidently does not know it; Matthew indirectly supplies one at a later occasion (Mt. 16:18).

The first pair of disciples are James and John. It should be noted that James is believed to be the elder and considered the more important. Jesus is said to have called them Boanerges, "sons of thunder." Here the Semitic original is remembered, though it appears in a transcription that makes its precise philological elucidation complicated. The Old Syriac has *benai ragsh(y)*; Galilean Aramaic may have had the same word for "thunder." No explanation of why Jesus called them that is given (cf. Lk. 9:54). If Andrew and Philip (both Greek names) are joined as a pair, this can be understood from the fact that they appear jointly in non-Synoptic tradition (cf. Jn. 6:5–8; 12:21–22). Bartholomew (i.e., son of Ptolemy?) and Matthew (short form of Mattathias) constitute the next pair; they too may have been associated in earliest legend. In Mt. 10:3, Matthew is called a publican (i.e., a tax collector) and in Mt. 9:9 he is substituted for the Levi of Mk. 2:14. Thomas ("twin," but perhaps used as a real name at this period under influence of Gr. *Didymus;* cf. Jn. 11:16, and Lat. *Geminus*) is paired with James the son of Alpheus (brother and perhaps successor of the Levi of Mk. 2:14?). The Fourth Gospel is interested in Thomas, but does not link him with James; other traditions may have done so. The last pair are Thaddeus and Simon the "Cananaean." The reason for this combination, too, is no longer discernible. The former name is a shortened form of a Greek name (probably Theodotus); Cananaean is a Latinized reproduction of Gr. *Kananáios.* (It has nothing to do with Canaanite, which has a different first consonant; cf. Mt. 15:22.) In the Luke and Acts lists he is called *Zēlōtēs,* or "zealot" (this gives the clue to the word "Cananaean"; the Aram. word for zealot is *qan'ānā,* pl. *qan'anayyā,* from which a Gr. adjective *Kananáios* was formed, just as Gr. *Pharisáios,* "Pharisee," was formed from the Aram. plural *perishayyā*).

The lone figure at the end is Judas Iscariot, "who betrayed him." The name "Iscariot" (some manuscripts "Iscarioth" or "Scariot"; in Mt. and Jn. *Iscariṓtēs*) cannot be explained with certainty. Etymologies based on Hebrew ("man of Karioth"; cf. Codex D in Jn. 6:71) are improbable; the term must be Aramaic. It seems likely that it was not applied to Judas until after the Passion and that it has a derogatory meaning (a derivative of the root *shqr,* "to lie," "to act faithlessly"?).

Total mystery envelopes the fate of most of these men. Legendary apocryphal Acts of various Apostles soon arose which sought to shed light on them. These books flourished among heretical groups, but orthodox churchmen like Eusebius were not averse to believing some of their stories.

It is considered problematic by many whether Jesus really had twelve disciples. The following observations may be made:

1. There was, indeed, in the Primitive Church of the first years a group called the Twelve, to whom Paul attributes one of the visions of the risen Lord (1 Cor. 15:5). The Essenes at Qumran also had a group of Twelve (plus three priests), who were at the head of their community. That suggests that the Twelve may have been an elective group of the Church. As they had all known Jesus it would be natural for later tradition to make them his disciples.

2. The four lists of disciples show some variations, which indicate that knowledge of who had belonged to this group was not firmly established in later times. This is compounded by the fact that the Fourth Gospel prominently mentions disciples who do not appear in any of the four lists.

3. If Jesus actually appointed twelve disciples the symbolism was of the tribes of Israel and seemingly implies Messianic aspirations (Mt. 19:28). But this clashes with the presentation in Mark (if we discount 2:10 and 2:28) that he did not reveal such aspirations until later, if at all (8:27–30). One would expect the naming of the Twelve, if it were historical, to have been deferred until then.

4. The preaching and casting out of demons by the Twelve is carried out only in token fashion in the narrative (6:7 f.); Mark is really thinking of a role of the Twelve in earliest Christian missionary work in Palestine.

5. The narratives 1:16–20 and 2:13–14 suggest that Jesus called disciples individually, as he encountered them. We therefore hear only of the calling of five men—one of whom, Levi the son of Alpheus, is not even found in the lists, though he may have been replaced by his brother. The facts about seven of the later group of twelve may no longer have been ascertainable. In John, too, we hear of the calling

of five disciples (1:35–51); the allusions to the Twelve are incidental.

6. When Mark wrote, Christians were used to official occasions of ordaining their leaders, and so it was desirable to describe an ordination of the Twelve by Jesus. Probably all that Mark had to go by was a list of the Twelve. He presented it with a narrative introduction to lend it the proper dignity.

3:20–22 The Pharisaic Accusation (Mt. 12:22–24; cf. Lk. 11:14–16)

vv. 20–21 Whether this piece belongs with 3:31 f. and has been artificially cut off from it by intrusion of 3:22–30 is a moot question. It is possible that it is entirely separate and that Mark has put it here to serve a twofold purpose: to prepare the reader for the charge brought by the scribes in v. 22 and for the saying of Jesus about his true relatives in 3:34. In the latter case, this is no real story, for by themselves 3:20–21 lead to nothing, but are only a piece of "historical" narration by Mark.

In the A.V., the words "and he came home" are improperly put in v. 19, at the conclusion of the list of the Apostles. They stand more correctly at the beginning of v. 20. A crowd assembles again (reference to the similar situation of 2:1?), so that they (Jesus and his disciples) cannot even "eat bread." Hearing of the latter situation, "those near him" (i.e., his family; A.V. and R.S.V., "his friends") went forth to lay hold on him. Those "near" Jesus can only be the same persons referred to in v. 31 as "his mother and his brothers." Their "going forth" then is a departure from Nazareth—or were they, too, residing at Capernaum (cf. Jn. 2:12) and merely going forth from another house? The intention of the family members was to "seize him" (the same word that is used in a hostile sense in 12:12; 14:46), for they thought: "He is beside himself"—here a medical term for insanity (cf. 2 Cor. 5:13). (In Is. 28:7, LXX, priest and prophet are beside themselves—but because of wine!) The family was naturally worried about the possibility of having discredit or misfortune brought upon it by a member, and wanted to restore Jesus to its bosom. It is worthy of note that both Matthew and Luke omitted this material, which did not agree with their assumption that Mary was prepared for Jesus' Messianic role by the manner of his birth.

v. 22 With this accusation of Jesus as "beside himself" has been coupled another charge. Scribes who had "come down" from Jerusalem (to the lower altitude of Galilee) assert that Jesus "has Beelzebul" and that through this ruler of the demons he is able to drive out the demons. (Mt. and Lk. introduce this charge in connection with the healing of a demoniac.) The available demonological lore of the time does not afford any other occurrence of this name, and so there is uncertainty about its spelling. "Beʿēl" is the Aramaic word for "lord," and "zebūl" is a Hebrew word meaning "dwelling." "Lord of the dwelling" is a reasonable name, though whether this means human habitations or the dwelling of the Devil (cf. the same word for the dwelling of God, 1 Kings 8:13) is doubtful. However the possibility exists that *zebūl* is a miswriting for *zebūb* (as presupposed by the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions) and that we here have the old Philistine "fly-god" Baal-zebub (2 Kings 1:4) demoted to the rank of (a regional?) prince of demons.

3:23–30 The Defense of Jesus (Mt. 12:25–37; Lk. 11:17–23; 12:10; 6:43–45)

v. 23 Jesus summons the scribes, who have evidently been disseminating this accusation, and speaks to them "in parables." This word, like the Semitic original which it translates (Heb. *māshāl;* Aram. *mathlā*), includes more than stories or fables invented to illustrate a point. It can refer to sayings artfully and vividly contrived, often with use of metaphorical language.

vv. 24–26 Jesus asks: "How can Satan (identified here with Beelzebul?) drive out Satan (by expelling his minions)?" The illustration of a kingdom or house (family, dynasty) that must fall because it is divided against itself is adduced, and the conclusion is drawn that if Satan has arisen (in hostile manner) against himself he also "cannot stand" (cf. Ps. 18:38, LXX), but "has an end" (cf. Lk. 22:37). In thus reducing the claim of his foes to an absurdity, Jesus implies that in reality he is subjecting the Devil and his minions through God's power.

v. 27 A second, short saying is linked with this: No one can capture and plunder the house of a strong man unless he first binds the man. Mark may have understood this to mean that Jesus has power over the Devil and hence is plundering the latter's house by driving out the demons.

vv. 28–30 Then follows an "Amen-saying" in which the Hebrew word is uniquely used by Jesus at the beginning of a statement for emphasis, rather than in response as in the Old Testament (cf. Deut. 27: 15 f.); in English Bible translations it is given as "verily" or "truly." Jesus declares: "All things (an interpretative remark is added: the sins and the blasphemies) will be forgiven the "sons of men" (= men), however much they blaspheme; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not have forgiveness forever, but is guilty of eternal sin." The concluding mention of the occasion, "for they had said he has an unclean spirit," shows that this was originally a separately reported saying. To accuse Jesus, who was full of Holy Spirit since his baptism (1:10; Lk. 4:1, 14) of being possessed of a demon was blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. This instruction was ecclesiastically useful (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3).

3:31–35 Jesus' True Relatives (Mt. 12: 46–50; Lk. 8:19–21). The narration by Mark in 3:20–22 not only prepared the reader's mind for the shock that Jesus was defamed as possessed, but also for this piece. This story, which is of the brief type, no doubt began with succinct mention of the situation in which Jesus spoke the saying of 3:34. Mark has converted that situation-identification into a narrative. "His mother and his brothers" (6:3) came and stood outside the house in which he was teaching (thus reverting to the situation of 3:20). They sent word to Jesus, calling him (to come out to them). The purpose of this is not clear from the context, but 3:20 suggests that the objective was to take Jesus back to Nazareth. Apprised of their presence, he asked, "Who are my mother and my brothers?" (On this Semitic type of locution cf. Judg. 9: 28). Looking at "those around him" in a circle (i.e., his disciples) he declared, "Behold (i.e., these are) my mother and my brothers!" (In Jn. 15:14 the word "friends" is used in similar application.) The statement is underlined by a further saying, probably coined by the traditioner or author to make a more general conclusion: "For whoever does the will of God (Mt. 7:21) he is my brother, sister and mother."

Why was this story handed down? Perhaps because it gave a valuable example to converts to Christianity who were troubled by the disapproval of their families. The saying taught them that Jesus himself had had a similar experience and had given the directive that one should find a substitute for one's relatives in the fellowship of those of like mind. One may wonder, too, whether there is not an antithesis here to the Lord's relatives—including his mother. They had all been opposed to his teaching activity. (In Jn. 7:5 the negative attitude of the brothers is also cited, though the mother is shielded, Jn. 2:5; 19:25.) Yet in Mark's time several of the very same brothers of Jesus who once had wanted to seize him were in control of the Jewish-Christian Church. Gentile Christians could infer from this story that there was no reason to give special honor to the kinsmen of Jesus. The men who had borne the heat and burden of the day in establishing Christianity were those who had been "around him"—the Twelve.

4:1–9 Parable of the Sower (Mt. 13:1–9; Lk. 8:4–8). Since 1:21 f., Mark has primarily related miracles of Jesus. True, he stated his initial message in 1:14, and he revealed his stand on some important matters such as fasting and the Sabbath (2: 18 ff.; and 2:23 ff.; 3:1 ff.); but he now proposes to give a sampling of his characteristic teaching in parables. Matthew, we may note, takes the opposite course; he first describes the teaching of Jesus (though not that in parables), and then relates the miracles.

In providing a slight narrative setting, Mark makes use of the idea which he had planted in 3:9; Jesus entered the boat to escape pressure of the crowd and spoke from that vantage point. He sat, after the manner of Jewish teachers, and did not stand, like a Hellenistic orator. "He taught them much in parables." Mark is thus conscious of giving only a selection of them. We have already noted at 3:23 that the word "parable" is capable of a considerable latitude of meaning. In the present connection it is primarily the invented story, fable, or allegory. Jesus began with the invitation, "Hear" (cf. 7:14; in the Old Testament usually with following identification of those addressed; cf. Judg. 9:7), and then related the parable of the sower. The method of sowing presupposed is throwing seed broadcast by hand and subsequently plowing it under with a wooden plow (which does not go very deep). The interest is on where the seed fell and in what happened to it. For here were no fields in our sense, but just areas of soil, some of them mere patches on crumbling limestone rock. For the purposes of the parable, a path runs through the land of this particular sower, providing a further hazard. Some of the seed falls on this path—the birds eat it; some on the rocky ground with shallow soil covering—it germinates quickly but soon withers, scorched by the sun; some falls among "thorns." One must not think of briers, but rather of thistles, and hardly of standing ones (cf. Jer. 4:3). The point is that the seed of thistles (the parent plants had no doubt been rooted out after the previous season) came up faster than the grain. They can grow up to six feet high and bear yellow, red, or blue blossoms. To have a crop of thorns and thistles is part of the hardship of farming (Gen. 3:18; cf. Jer. 12:13; Job 31:40). But the good land produces a rich harvest (thirty, sixty, one hundredfold). We are told that realistically a sevenfold harvest is the average expectation in Arab Palestine, with twelvefold rare and thirtyfold a maximum. The figures given in the parable either apply only to the seed that fell on good soil or are an exaggeration (cf. also Gen. 26:12). Jesus concludes with an admonition to seek the meaning of the parable and to give it close attention. The point of the parable apparently is that despite all failure there will be a glorious harvest: many will be won for God's kingdom.

4:10–12 The Reason for the Parables (Mt. 13:10–15; Lk. 8:9–10). Mark takes occasion here to add an editorially composed section throwing light on Jesus' parable-speaking. So bent is he on imparting this instruction that he loses sight of the fact that in 4:35 Jesus is still in the boat teaching the people with parables when evening comes. He relates that when they were alone (which could only be after a day's teaching was ended) "those about him" *with the Twelve* (a gloss? cf. 3:34 where the phrase "those about him" meant the Twelve) asked Jesus the meaning of the parables. He replied that to them it is given to know the secret of the kingdom of God (they have the authoritative interpretation of what Jesus meant), to "those outside" all things (= teachings) come only in parable form. This reveals the need that was felt in Mark's time and earlier to curb the wildly sprouting heretical ideas. The ecclesiastical line which he represents stressed the esoteric knowledge of the Apostles and sought to develop authoritative exegesis. The purpose of Jesus' parable-teaching was to fulfill Is. 6:9, viz., to increase the people's blindness, deafness, and lack of receptivity and to bring about their destruction (cf. Jn. 12:37 ff.). This is rather fearful predestinarian theory, and it raises the question why Mark should have adopted it here. At the bottom of the matter lies the problem of why the ministry of Jesus to the Jews had failed. A solution had been attempted by Paul with the help of Old Testament ideas in Rom. 9:14 ff. This Pauline theory has been carried back into the Gospel story by Mark. The shadow of the cross has fallen on the account of the ministry of Jesus.

4:13–20 The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mt. 13:18–23; Lk. 8:11–15). A fresh start is made. The question of v. 10, about the meaning of the parable, here finds its response. Jesus says: "They (the disciples) do not understand this parable, and how will they understand all the (other) parables?" The parable of the sower is then given a rather cumbersomely worded allegorical interpretation. The seed is "the Word" (cf. 2:2). The various kinds of ground on which it falls represent various kinds of people: (1) [The seed fallen along] the path: where the Word is sown and when they hear it Satan immediately comes and takes away the Word sown into them. (2) The [seed fallen on] rocky ground: those who receive the Word with joy (like group 4, though that is not mentioned there), but have no root in themselves (i.e., the Word cannot take root in their inner life). Rather, they are of short duration (with respect to the impression the Word makes on them and hence "likewise" joins them with group 1). Then when tribulation or persecution on account of the Word comes about they immediately take offense. (3) [Those sown amid] the thorns: they are such as hear the Word, but the cares of the (present) world-age and the deceit of wealth and the invading desires concerning the remaining things (pleasure, honor, etc.) choke the Word, so that it becomes fruitless. (4) [Those sown on] the good land: they who hear the word, accept it, and bear fruit as described in v. 8. The interest is centered on groups 2 and 3; groups 1 and 4 require and receive but little commentary. This interpretation, however, must be regarded as a product of Christian reflection, seeking to make the parable fruitful for the Church of Mark's day.

4:21–25 Concerning the Right Use of Parables (Lk. 8:16–18). Mark here appends a series of Sayings that seem to him germane to this subject.

v. 21 Jesus asks whether the lamp comes (into the room) to be set under a *modius* (= container; a two-gallon measure) or under a bed (= bedstead) or to provide illumination? Mark may be thinking of the teaching of Jesus, but Mt. 5: 15 f. puts a similar saying in the Sermon on the Mount and takes it as referring to Christian conduct.

vv. 22–23 In this saying, Mark may have seen a further elucidation of v. 11: that which is a mystery exists in order to be revealed. (But this saying appears in different connections in Mt. 10:26; Lk. 12:2.) The exhortation to hear is repeated (cf. v. 9), perhaps to establish a transition to the next saying.

vv. 24–25 A third saying combines two originally separate items, as comparison with Mt. 7:2, Lk. 6:38 and Mt. 25:29, Lk. 19:26 show: (1) One will receive over and above the measure with which one gives (omitted in Lk. 6:38). (2) To him that hath shall be given. Mark may have construed this material to mean that profit will accrue according to the measure of attention given to the "Word" of vv. 14 ff. and that he who profits but a little (through such lack of attention) will soon lose that little.

4:26–29 Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly. On the abridged opening formula used here cf. below on vv. 30–32. In this parable another aspect of the kingdom is revealed. The farmer performs his task of sowing and then lets nature take its course, certain that results will accrue in due time. The process of the growth of the plant is vividly described, thus supplementing the parable of the sower, 4:8. When the status of the fruit permits, the farmer immediately sends the sickle (i.e., the workers wielding it) because the harvest is come (cf. Jn. 4:36. The stony Palestinian fields required use of the sickle. As this was slow work it was important to start it as soon as possible). Thus God lets things run their course, having tended to the planting of the seeds of the kingdom. But he will not delay with the judgment when the time is ripe. This beautiful parable is reported only by Mark. Matthew has substituted for it the parable of the tares.

4:30–32 Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mt. 13:31–32; Lk. 13:18–19). The parable of 4:3 ff. began in simple narrative fashion. Here, however, we encounter a beginning with a question and answer: "With what shall we compare . . . ? It is like. . . ." This corresponds closely to the style of the rabbinic parables, which have such introductions as: "To what is the thing like (Heb. *dōmeh*)? To (Heb. *le*) . . ." The Greek word rendered "it is like" in 4:30 (a mere *hōs,* "as") is the equivalent of the Hebrew "to" in the rabbinic formula. The abridged start with "to," leaving out the question—also occurring in rabbinic texts—was presupposed earlier in v. 26. In the present parable the initial question is provided with a parallel: or by what parable shall we set it forth?

The kingdom of God is here compared with a mustard seed, a tiny pellet that produces a shrub eight to ten feet high. It illustrates the marvelous power inherent in the message that God is planting in the world.

4:33–34 The Parabolic Way of Teaching (Mt. 13:34–35). A general narrative statement—likewise ignoring the boat situation of 4:1 and 4:36—concludes this account of Jesus' preaching: To the public he spoke only in parables, but privately to his own disciples he gave the necessary explanations. This is in line with the view Mark has incorporated in 4:10–12, and is clearly artificial. Jesus, like any other preacher, used illustrations to make clear to his hearers what he was trying to say, not to obscure what he was saying. That he spoke only in parables seems exaggerated, though it may be that Mark is here taking the word in its wide range of meaning (cf. 3:23).

4:35–41 The Calming of the Tempest (Mt. 8:18, 23–27; Lk. 8:22–25). A series of three narratives of the more elaborate type—first encountered in the story of the leper 1:40–45—is linked together in 4:35–5:43. Only a few, brief words were needed at the beginning of each unit to establish a transition. In the case of the first, Mark is able to utilize the boat situation of 4:1, for the story involves a boat ride on the lake. He therefore has Jesus suggest a crossing to the other shore in v. 35. If v. 36 says: they (the disciples) took him with them in the boat "just as he was" (= where he, indeed, was) this last phrase is also editorial, for it revises the previous statement which meant that they received him into the boat, thus presupposing a different set of circumstances. Another curious point is that other boats accompanied them. This may have been meaningful in some earlier version of the story, but has lost its significance, for they are not referred to again; Matthew and Luke simply omit this item.

A sudden gale (such as often hits the lake of Galilee from the west) raised high waves, and the boat began to fill with water. Jesus was asleep in the stern (head resting) on a cushion. (For a prophet asleep in a storm cf. Jon. 1:5.) They woke him up, saying, "Teacher, does it not concern thee that we perish?" (They may have expected that he would pray for divine aid as Jonah was asked to do; Jon. 1:6). Awakening, he rebuked the wind and said to the sea, "Be still! Be silent!" (One suspects that since there are two words of command, one originally applied to wind and the other to sea.) It is worthy of note that the second command is identical with the one addressed to the demon in 1:24. The winds, too, were regarded as minor divinities or demons. At the command of Jesus the wind abated and a great calm (of the sea) followed. Jesus asked the disciples why they were so cowardly, and how it was they had no faith. Their reaction was one of great fear (Jon. 1:10, 16) and they said to each other, "Who then is this one that the wind and the sea obey him?" This "chorus" makes an effective conclusion, even though it is not too appropriate to have them talk about Jesus in his immediate presence in a small boat.

Stories of storms on the waters, of shipwrecks or of hairbreadth escapes from them were no doubt common wherever men lived by seas or lakes. In the book of Jonah such a one was utilized, and the psalm that was included in that narrative hints at the deliverance of a man who was nearly drowned. Among the thanksgiving hymns from Qumran there is one in which the speaker compares himself to a sailor in a ship in a storm that brought him to the gates of death (1 Q H VI, 22 f.). It is not outside the pale of Jewish thinking to have a storm subside in response to prayer. But it is something quite unusual to have a holy man command wind and waters to be quiet. This is the focal element in the story. The interest is centered on the miracleworker who does the impossible. For a moment it is unveiled to the reader that Jesus was more than a mere man—his divine nature shines through the human, as through a transparency. It is thus the "Epiphany" idea that is central in this tale (cf. p. 37 f.). In contrast to this stands the stupidity of the disciples, who are incapable of taking the final step of recognizing him as the Son of God. Alongside the mythical element there remains a faint remembrance of an occasion in which Jesus slept in the storm and chided the terror-stricken disciples for their cowardice and lack of faith.

5:1–20 The Gerasene Demoniac (Mt. 8: 28–34; Lk. 8:26–39). This, too, is a narrative of the detailed, vivid type. It could have begun originally in some such fashion as: "Once Jesus crossed the lake to the country of the Gerasenes." By a slight change a seeming continuity is established with the preceding story. Gerasenes, people of the city of Gerasa (today *Jerash,* famed for Hellenistic-Roman ruins of the Christian era), is only one of several readings; other manuscripts have "Gadarenes" or "Gergesenes." The city that actually had control of the district meant was Hippos—like Gerasa and Gadara one of the Hellenistic cities of the Decapolis. It seems probable that originally no city name was mentioned and that Gerasa as an important place in the second and third centuries represents a first attempt at identification, which then led to corrections.

On disembarking, Jesus was met by a demoniac, who lived in tombs and whose carryings on greatly interested the storyteller so that he goes into much detail. The man possessed superhuman strength—could even break chains and no one could subdue him. He was abroad day and night, crying out and smiting himself with stones. Upon seeing Jesus, the demoniac runs toward him while the demon inside cries out, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God?" (Gr. *Hýpsistos,* originally name of a pagan god, but appropriated by the Jews as epithet for their God) and adjures Jesus not to torture him. (A parenthetical remark—probably glossatory—adds that Jesus had ordered the demon to go forth. The usual command to the demon to be silent is omitted in this narrative.) Jesus now asks the demon his name, and the latter gives it as "Legion (Latin loan word), for we are many," an answer suggesting that this is a collective name. Ordinarily seven or eight demons were a maximum to inhabit one man (Lk. 8:2). The demons do not want to be left without a habitation (cf. Mt. 12:43) and beg to be permitted to enter a nearby herd of swine. The Jews were forbidden to have swine, according to a rule which was allegedly developed in 65 B.C., which but scarcely could have been fully accepted at the time of Christ (cf. Mt. 7:6, which presupposes the raising of swine). In primarily heathen territory such as the Decapolis (the federation of ten Greek cities in Transjordan) herds of swine may have existed, but the number two thousand here given (v. 13) may simply be an inference from the name "Legion" (uninformed estimate? Actually five to six thousand men). Jesus permits the "Legion" to go forth into the swine. The latter in panic dash over the cliff and are drowned. The swineherds flee and report the incident "to the city and the fields" (6:36, hamlets?). The natives come to find the man restored to health. This public certification of healing belongs to the conclusion of such a story. The reaction is one of fear of the awesome power of this wonderworker, rather than of rejoicing at the healing of a sufferer. They beg Jesus to leave their territory. Therewith the tale reaches its proper end.

Mark has, however, added a further conclusion—probably out of his own stock of knowledge. The healed demoniac is anxious to go with Jesus in the boat, but Jesus does not permit him, and instructs him to go home and report to "his own" what the Lord (Codex D: God) has done and (how) he has had mercy on him. The man went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis (7:31; Mt. 4:25) what Jesus had done to him, and all marveled. The Decapolis was heathen territory; perhaps for that reason Mark (writing for Gentile Christians) portrays Jesus as encouraging the man to bear witness instead of commanding silence, as usual.

5:21–43 The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood (Mt. 9: 18–26; Lk. 8:40–56). A transition is made in 5:21 to this narrative, which again is of the more detailed type, by mention of a recrossing of the lake. How loose the connection is, can be seen from the fact that Matthew can introduce a very different episode here (Mt. 9:1 ff.) and follow it with additional incidents, involving a return to the town, before taking up this story. The opening situation presupposed by the tale as received by Mark was simply: "Once when Jesus was beside the sea, with a great crowd gathered about, etc."

A "ruler of the synagogue"—an official whose duty it was to see that all things were properly arranged for that institution and its services—appealed to Jesus to come and lay hands on his "little daughter" (affectionate use of the diminutive) that she might be saved (= healed) and live. Jesus goes with him to the nearby town, and is followed by a crowd.

A healing story, which could once have been told independently, is now sandwiched between the two parts of the story of Jairus. The combination was pre-Marcan, for they cannot readily be separated. The lesser one requires the pressure of a crowd following Jesus and serves to delay his arrival at the sickbed with the consequences mentioned in v. 35. It concerns a woman about whose health history the narrator is quite loquacious: "She was in (the condition of) the flow of blood" for twelve years, and had suffered many things from many physicians and had spent all she had, profiting nothing, but rather going (from bad) to worse. This type of description is characteristic of ancient healing narratives found in Hellenistic sources. Hearing "the things concerning Jesus," the woman came from behind in the crowd and touched his garment (6:56). She reasoned that if she did that she might be saved (= healed). The effect is immediate: "The fountain of her blood (so Lev. 12:7) dried up." But Jesus knew in himself that power had gone forth from him—power imagined like energy, the supply of which can be noticeably lessened—and turning asked who had touched him. The disciples gave an explanation that showed their total lack of understanding of the situation. Disregarding their words, Jesus looked about to see who had done this. The woman now came forward in fear and trembling (of the holy man), knowing what had happened to her. She fell down before him and told him the whole truth. Addressing her in kindly manner as "daughter," he declared that her faith has saved (= healed) her, bade her depart in peace and be (= remain) free from her scourge. There is no indication that the laws of Lev. 15: 25 f. (or their rabbinic elaboration, as preserved in the Mishnah Order VI, tract 9, *Zābīm*) played any role whatever in the situation. The story-telling is Hellenistic (notably in the allusion to physicians). The vivid detail is typical of the style of narratives of the more detailed type. The story does, however, contain a religious point—the emphasis on faith, found so often in stories of the short type.

A transition back to the story of Jairus is made with the words "while he was still speaking." (Originally the transition may have been "when they were on the way.") The continuation then states: There came some from the ruler ('s house) saying that his daughter had expired. Why did he plague the teacher (further)? Overhearing what was said, Jesus told the ruler not to fear, but only to have faith. (The healing of the woman was certainly a factor of an encouraging nature.) Jesus now forbade others to follow, and took only Peter, James, and "John the brother of James" with him. (Andrew has strangely dropped out of the original group of four, though he reappears in 13:3.)

Upon reaching the ruler's house, Jesus saw the tumult and those weeping and wailing much. Going in he said to them, "Why do you make a tumult and weep? The child (Gr. *paidíon*) is not dead but sleeps." They laughed at him (the only instance of this in the Gospels). He drove all out of the house (because he could do no miracle before unbelievers? 6:5), and taking along the parents of the child "and those with him" went in to where the child was. He took hold of the hand of the child (the important healing gesture in the case of those prostrated; cf. 1:31) and said to her, *"Talithá koum."* Mark explains this as meaning, "O maiden (Gr. *korásion*), I say to thee, arise." However, "I say to thee" is not contained in the Aramaic. (Codex D has a peculiar reading which presupposes an alternate Aramaic word for maiden, *rebītha;* and for the second word, more accurately has *koumi;* what Jesus said was, in modern transcription, "*ṭelīthā qūmī.*") The maiden immediately arose and walked about. The narrative adds, "for she was twelve years old"—apparently a commentary on the use of the word "maiden" (cf. 6:22). The word "child," which was previously used by Jesus in v. 39, suggested a girl of, at most, seven years.

The parents were completely "beside themselves." He commanded them many things (= earnestly) that no one should learn of this—a remark which certainly seems strange in view of the fact that public mourning had already begun. This remark has evidently been injected into the older narrative on the basis of the theory of the secret of the person of Jesus (7:36; 8:26). It showed, too, that Jesus did not wish to be celebrated as miracle-worker and helped explain why he was not accepted as Messiah in spite of all his great deeds. The original ending of the story was: "And he said to give her to eat." Her eating was the proof that she was really alive and felt well. A rabbinic story of the cure of a son of Gamaliel II (*c.* A.D. 90) through prayer of another rabbi ends with the statement: "In that moment he (the sick person) requested food."

For Mark this was a miracle of raising a dead person. The words of v. 39, however, throw doubt on this; Jesus says that the child is not dead but sleeps (i.e., is in a coma?). One can hardly attach such subtlety to his words as is implied in those of a third-century rabbi: "God said to Jacob, thou wilt sleep but wilt not die." On the other hand, the words "maiden arise" fit better with the resuscitation idea. In view of the use of the term "child" through v. 41a and of "maiden" from that point on one may well ask whether two different versions of this incident—one of a child in a coma and one of a deceased maiden—have not been fused.

6:1–6a Jesus Rejected in Nazareth (Mt. 13:53–58; Lk. 4:16–30). This was an independent unit of the short anecdotal type. It may have begun. "Once Jesus came to his native city." But Mark has linked it with the preceding story by mention of a departure "from there"—presumably meaning Capernaum. No reason is given for his leaving that place, and one can only speculate about it. (Herod's interest in him, reported in v. 14 f.?) The statement about the disciples following him is put at the end of the sentence instead of after the first clause. Their mention is evidently an afterthought, a "planting" for 6:7 f.

The story says not a word about how Jesus was received, but proceeds immediately to the Sabbath service in the synagogue, at which he "taught." The many who heard him were amazed and asked: "Whence does this one (i.e., this unqualified person) have these things?" (Specifically:) "What is this wisdom that is given him?" (The ordained rabbi is called the *ḥākām* or "wise man" in rabbinic texts. Jesus has been granted "wisdom" without a regular course of study.) "And such powers (i.e., works of power) are (reportedly) being done by his hands (i.e., through him)? (Whence are they?) Is he not the carpenter (Gr. *téktōn,* woodworker, craftsman), the son of Mary (substituted for the father's name which would normally have been the one mentioned?), the brother of James, Joses, Juda (R.S.V.: Judas) and Simon? And are not his (married) sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him. Jesus said to them, "The prophet is nowhere without honor except in his fatherland (Gr. *patris;* Old Latin *patria;* but the Old Syriac in which this passage is not preserved corrects to 'his city' in the parallels) and among his relatives and in his house (i.e., immediate family)."

The saying is reported in a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus in Egypt in a shorter form, but with another parallel statement following it: "A prophet is not acceptable in his fatherland, nor does a physician do healings to those that know him (familiarly)." It is quite possible that the full saying was used in this story in its pre-Marcan form, but that Mark dropped the element about the physician (of which an echo still appears in Luke's version, 4:23) in order to work in the stricture against relatives and family. He thereby gives a further hint of the strained relations with these (cf. 3:31 ff.).

It has been held that the story as received by Mark originally ended with the saying of v. 4, for therein it makes its point. Luke, however, presupposes a version of it in which Jesus was challenged to do miracles (Lk. 4:23). Mark evidently had knowledge of such a version and has taken note of it in his conclusion, merely giving the outcome that Jesus could not do any miracles there. But this is immediately modified (by a later editor?) with the remark that he healed a few people suffering from weakness by laying on of hands. Mark concludes suitably by saying: "He marveled at their unbelief." There could be no healing where there was no faith in the ability to heal, for unbelief blocks all channels through which the "power" of the healer can flow into the other person.

6:6b–13 The Sending out of the Disciples (Mt. 9:35; 10:1, 9–14; Lk. 9:1–6). Mark, in a transitional statement, speaks of Jesus going about in the villages teaching. He is thinking of the environment of Nazareth. But it is noteworthy that the same report appears in more developed form in Mt. 9:35 f., likewise preceding the sending out of the disciples, but entirely detached from any thought of Nazareth. Mark's placement of 6:7 ff. is thus his own construction, which he loses sight of in 6:30 ff. where Jesus is in the lake region. The sending out of the disciples must thus be considered an independent piece, having the form of "historical" narration by the author. It seems probable that all that Mark actually had as source material was a document containing rules for the missionary work of the disciples. Real tradition would have given an itinerary or would have stressed the leading role of one or the other of these men. Missionary practice as he knew it provided him with the narrative essentials—a charging, a sending out, and a return (6:7, 12–13, 30). Mark had already planted the idea of sending out with the appointment of the Twelve, 3:14–15.

Jesus sent them out two by two (cf. Eccl. 4:9), and gave them power over the "unclean spirits" (3:15, demons). They were commanded to take nothing along except a staff (but cf. Mt. 10:10; Lk. 9:3)—no bread, no knapsack (Gr. *pēra;* cf. the one worn by the Good Shepherd of the Lateran statue), no copper money in the belt, but shod with sandals—"and you shall not be clad in two garments" (Gr. *chitōn;* cf. Jn. 21:7 where the outer chiton's name is used). This is directly quoted from the instruction sheet; what preceded was indirect quotation.

vv. 10–11 With a new "he said to them," Mark introduces the most essential operational instruction: They are not to change hosts. (The stay in a given place was probably to be short; in the Didache 11:4 two days were allowed.) Where a town turns them away (no one offering hospitality) they are to shake off the dust that is under their feet (Lk. "the dust of their feet") "for a testimony to them" (as in 1:44; 13:9 with juridical force). This is illustrated in later missionary practice in Acts 13:51, though one does not get a clear idea of what was actually done (taking off the sandals and cleaning the dirt from them?). It evidently was a familiar gesture of radical dissociation, but is not mentioned in nonbiblical sources. The underlying thought may have been not to carry along on one's feet any of the dust of a wicked place that is under a curse of doom. The disciples thereupon went forth, preached repentance (1:15), drove out demons, and anointed the sick (Mark inferring this from Christian practice; cf. Jas. 5:14 f.) and healed them—thus carrying on the work of Jesus in multiplied fashion through delegated power.

These instructions—and the more detailed ones in Matthew—may be compared with what Josephus (*B. J.*, *2*, 8, 4) relates of the Essenes, who, according to him, had groups "in every city" (after they were scattered from the Qumran area?). They relied on hospitality, carrying nothing at all with them when they traveled. (As an exception, he notes that they took weapons for fear of robbery, presumably in view of the reign of terror in the seventh decade; cf. p. 94.) They were not allowed to have a change of garments (a directive that may have bearing on v. 9) or of sandals until those they wore were torn to pieces or worn out. The similarity of their rules to those given the disciples does not necessarily prove a connection between Christianity and Essenism, but shows how similar religious motives and ideas produce similar phenomena.

6:14–16 Herod's Opinion of Jesus (Mt. 14:1–2; Lk. 9:7–9). A short "historical" piece is put here by Mark. It leads to the story of 6:17–29, which serves as a filler for the period during which the disciples were absent, and for which, accordingly, there was no report of the acts of Jesus. Herod Antipas, whom Mark calls "king" (Lk. and Mt.: "tetrarch"), heard about Jesus, for his name had become known, and he said: "John the Baptist has been raised from the dead, and therefore the (supernatural) powers (5:30) are working in him." That a dead man might return was thus an idea that even a worldly person like Herod presumably could entertain. (The belief in such a possibility prepared the way for the acceptance of reports of Jesus' own resurrection.)

Other views were also expressed about John: he is Elijah (whose return to earth from heaven was expected); or he is a prophet, as one of the prophets, i.e., another prophet of the ancient sort—their kind having been extinct for a long while (but cf. Lk. 9:8). Herod insisted, "John, whom I beheaded—this one has been raised up." Mark, however, repeats this opinion of Herod merely to work in the allusion to the beheading of John, and thus to lead to the story of the death of the Baptist as a flash back. There is no sequel to 6:14–16 after 6:17–29. Perhaps it could have none. If Herod superstitiously believed Jesus to be a risen John, he would know that he was powerless to harm him. But Mark's presentation of Herod's views cannot be relied upon. A scrap of information preserved in Lk. 13:31, where Jesus is warned that Herod wants to kill him, has the ring of truth. There thus must have been a line of tradition explaining Jesus' wanderings into regions outside the tetrarchy with peril of arrest by Herod. It is noteworthy that Matthew connects the departure of Jesus across the lake to the Decapolis territory with his hearing of John's death (Mt. 14:13).

6:17–29 The Death of the Baptist (Mt. 14:3–12; cf. Lk. 3:19–20). This is a unique kind of narrative among those in the Gospels. Since it deals with the death of a holy man, it is a legend, but it is strongly influenced by secular story-telling. It was probably derived by Mark from oral reporting in circles belonging to the sect that revered the memory of the Baptist. The Essenes of Qumran in like manner held sacred the memory of the "Teacher of Righteousness," but the story of his martyrdom has not been preserved.

It is worthy of note that this story is rather charitable toward Herod Antipas, who, it says, regarded his prisoner as a righteous and holy man whom he heard gladly. John allegedly had denounced the marriage of Herod to Herodias, and had been jailed for doing so—presumably on the insistence of Herodias. Her rancor was not satisfied by that, however, for she wanted John's death. In view of the tetrarch's attitude she therefore resorted to a strategem to accomplish her purpose. At the occasion of the tetrarch's birthday party she sent her daughter Salome to dance before Herod and his friends. Such feasts were stag affairs, at which respectable women did not appear. The girl so delighted him and his boon companions that he promised to fulfill any request she might make; and he tied himself down with a vow, promising even half of his kingdom. The girl first had to seek her mother's advice. She then hastened back and demanded immediate delivery of the head of John the Baptist on a platter. Ashamed to break his word, the king dispatched a guardsman who executed John and brought in his head, which the girl then carried to her mother. John's disciples took the headless body and buried it in a tomb. If Jerome (fifth century) is right, it was at the city of Samaria. According to Theodoret (also fifth century) it was desecrated by Emperor Julian the Apostate (361–363). As Mark has no use for Samaria or Samaritans it is understandable that he omits naming the burial place.

This story is a folk tale dealing with historical persons. It is true that Herod married a brother's wife and that this wife had a daughter named Salome from her first marriage. It is also true that Herod had John executed, after keeping him in prison for a long time. From there on the popular imagination has been at work in creating this memorable tale, with inspiration provided by other stories. An excellent parallel in some respects is afforded by the story of Xerxes, who also is said to have tied his own hands by an oath (cf. *Herod., 9,* 109). It is worthy of note that Luke does not repeat Mark's story. He had better sources of information about Herod (cf. Acts 13:2). Josephus, who tells us most of what we know about the Herodians, says that Antipas put John to death "out of fear that he might become the leader of a rebellion, since his influence with the people was great" (*Ant., 18,* 5, 2). This has the ring of truth, and also explains why Jesus was in peril from Herod (Lk. 13:31). Josephus states, furthermore, that John was held imprisoned in Machaerus—a fortress east of the Dead Sea, too remote to be the scene of a birthday celebration. From Josephus, finally, we know that Herodias was not the wife of Philip, but rather of a half-brother named Herod. Philip's wife was Salome. Indeed, it is quite probable that she was no longer a young girl when John was executed, but had already been married for some time to Philip, who died in A.D. 34. After his death she married Aristobulus, a son of Herod of Chalcis. Her new husband was made king of Lesser Armenia by Nero. Her portrait is preserved on coins.

6:30–44 The Return of the Disciples and the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mt. 14:13–21; Lk. 9:10–17; cf. Jn. 6:1–13). Mark continues with "historical narration." Instead of taking up the thread where he left off at 6:15 he continues 6:13, and relates the return of "the Apostles" from their journey. They reported all things to him "what they had done and taught." (Just so, Mark thinks, the Christian missionaries must report to the authorities sending them out. Their preaching, too, is controlled. Cf. Gal. 2:2, where the independent Paul conforms to this following a revelation.)

Jesus now invites the disciples to go apart with him to a "waste place" (1:35) and rest a while. They (instead of Jesus?) are being so much importuned that they have no time to eat (cf. 3:20). So Jesus and his disciples depart in a boat to a waste place. One wonders whether this item reflects or is intended to justify occasional "retreats" of the Apostles in the days of the Primitive Church.

In 6:33, we strike the bedrock of the older independent narrative to which Mark has been making a transition. This narrative does not concern itself at all with recreation for the disciples, as one would expect from 6:31. It is rather like the sea crossing of 4:35; no doubt it originally related that Jesus himself sought to escape the pressure of the crowd. At the point where Mark takes it up, it is made plain that Jesus failed in this quest. The boat's departure was observed, and many learned of it; from all the cities people flocked to the place toward which the boat was steering, and arrived ahead of it. How the news was carried so fast to "all" cities—presumably those along the southwestern and southern shore: Tarichaea (or Magdala), Tiberias, Hammath, Sennabris, and Philoteria—and how people could get to even a southerly landing on the eastern shore ahead of a boat crossing the lake is not easy to see. The localization of the incident in that area is supported by Jn. 6:23 (see p. 290; on Luke's divergent localization, see p. 220).

On going ashore and seeing the people, Jesus is filled with sympathy because they are as sheep without a shepherd (1 Kings 22:17)—in the parallel 8:1–9 the sympathy is based on their physical hunger—so he begins to teach them much. In this way it gets to be late in the day. The disciples call Jesus' attention to the fact and suggest he dismiss the people, so that they may go into the fields (5:14) and villages round about to buy food for themselves. Jesus instead bids the disciples to give them food. They then ask whether they should go away and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread and then give them to eat (contrast Jn. 6:7). (This is another instance of their complete lack of understanding of Jesus' person and powers.) In reply, Jesus asks them how many loaves they have, instructing them to go and see (in the boat). They bring back the report that there are five loaves and two (dried?) fishes. Whereupon Jesus commands the disciples to gather the people into symposia-groups (reclining groups, Gr. dining custom) on the greensward. They were arranged like flower beds (Ecclus. 24:29) in fifties and hundreds (which made serving them easier). Jesus takes the loaves and fishes and looking up to heaven speaks the blessing. Then he breaks the bread in his characteristic manner and gives it to his disciples to distribute, and he likewise divides the two fishes. All eat and are satisfied. Twelve baskets full of fragments are allegedly picked up. (One must not ask where they got the baskets.) The gathering up of food remnants that fell on the ground during a meal was evidently pious custom (perhaps of superstitious origin, as a rabbinic tale suggests) and is even prescribed in later Jewish law. Here it serves to underline and conclude the story. Strangely, nothing is said about the reaction of the crowd or of the disciples to the stupendous miracle.

Mark's story is an example of the elaborate type of narrative and, furthermore, one that makes manifest the divine nature of the person of Jesus (an Epiphany story). For a brief moment the reader glimpses the creator's power at work through a man. Such a story is a product of faith. To ask how it originated is like asking a flower how it grew. One can, however, discern certain stimuli tending toward its production. The story of Elisha in 2 Kings 4:42–44 is an important one. Belief that in the Messianic times there would be miraculous feeding (cf. Jn. 6:30–34) may be another. But perhaps the Christian communal meal (Gr. *agápē*) in which the rite of the Lord's Supper was celebrated also played its part. At these occasions Christ was believed invisibly present, and the remembrance of how he broke the bread in his official family was vividly experienced. A story of this nature was like a transparency. Faith saw through reported facts to their deeper meaning. In John's version this aspect is dominant.

6:45–52 Walking on the Water (Mt. 14:22–33; cf. Jn. 6:15–21)

vv. 45–48a In order to include this story, which is of the second, more detailed type, Mark again has to provide "historical" narrative leading over to it. The received story presupposed that the disciples were alone on the lake in the night. When was that the case? He finds a suitable occasion for it in the evening situation of 6:44 (cf. v. 35). Jesus compelled the disciples to embark and directed them to precede him to the other shore, to Bethsaida, while he dismissed the crowd. The objective mentioned is reminiscent of Luke's different setting of the feeding miracle (Lk. 9:10) and is later lost sight of (v. 53). Having sent the disciples off—the desire to be rid of them is made very apparent—Jesus dismissed the people (who had to shift for themselves for the night) and ascended the mountain (-side) to pray (but also to be at a vantage point with a view over the lake).

When evening came the boat was in the middle of the lake (about three and one-half miles away) and he was alone on land. He saw the disciples in distress, trying to make headway against the wind. Possibly this item was added by Mark himself in view of the transition he is making to the received story, vv. 48b–52, for some delaying factor was needed to account for the fact that the disciples were still on the lake at the time mentioned in v. 48. Since Mark is forced to have them depart before sundown, they should have reached the other shore an hour or so after dark. The wind has no further importance for the story (in contrast to 4:37 f.).

vv. 48b–52 We here reach the bedrock material. The tale no doubt began very simply with some such statement as: "Once the disciples were on the lake in the night" (cf. Lk. 5:5; Jn. 21:3); Mark has substituted his transitional narrative of vv. 45–48a for the original beginning. In the fourth watch of the night (3–6 A.M., hence toward dawn)—so the story relates—Jesus came to them, walking on the sea. He wanted to go past them (a peculiar element in this tale). They, seeing a figure walking on the water, thought it was a ghost and cried out. The narrator repeats: They *all* had seen him (not just Peter?) and were startled. Jesus then reassured them. He stepped into the ship and (immediately) the wind subsided. The disciples were very much beside themselves. Since the reader must wonder how they could be amazed at Jesus' miraculous powers when they had just seen them demonstrated on such a grand scale, Mark adds a closing commentary: "For they had not understood the miracles of the loaves, their heart being hardened" (cf. 8:17; Rom. 11:7; Jn. 12:40). It may be that the element about the wind dying down in v. 51 was worked into the story by Mark under stimulus of 4:37, for it has no particular relevance here except in relation to v. 48.

What is the meaning of this story? It must, like its predecessor, the feeding story, be regarded as another instance of the manifestation of the divine nature of Jesus (an "Epiphany" story). The item of Jesus going past the boat fits well with this; originally he may not have been thought of as entering it at all. He walked on the water not to rejoin his disciples but to give them a glimpse of his divine nature. One can only speculate about the origin of such a story. In this case the mythological approach seems promising. Myths relating the appearances of deities to fishermen and sailors were no doubt told wherever there were lakes and seas. In Ecclus. 24:4 ff. where mythology of a goddess has been borrowed to describe the role of personified Wisdom, we hear her say, "I lived on the heights and my throne was on the pillar of cloud. The circuit of heaven I compassed alone and in the depth of the abyss I walked."

Mythical "motifs" are frequently transferred to stories about historical individuals, as indicative of the supernatural factor manifested in their attaining greatness. Perhaps Luke omitted this story because he knew pagan stories somewhat like it. He certainly placed no great value on it or he would have told it. (Matthew gave it more meaning by extending it.) Another possibility is that we have here a misplaced story of an appearance of the risen Christ. Does v. 50 mean that this time they all had seen the Lord—not just Peter (1 Cor. 15:5)? Is Jn. 21:4 ff. a different version of the same incident? We presently lack the means to answer such questions. The tale was doubtless tremendously impressive to the ancient readers of Mark, to whom its credibility was no stumbling block.

6:53–56 The Return to Gennesar (Mt. 14:34–36). This could have continued any departure from the eastern shore. It is historical narration by Mark. Crossing over (5:21) to the land they came to Gennesaret (Codex D and Old Syriac; *Gennesar*, which agrees with the name as given in 1 Macc. 11:67 and Josephus. The name has probably been conflated with that of Chinnereth; cf. Deut. 3:17 etc.). The Old Syriac reads: "And when they crossed over they went up (to a more northerly area?) to the land of Gennesar." When they went forth from the boat Jesus was recognized at once and people ran through that whole country (to report his return). They began to bring the sick on their beds to wherever they heard he was. When he entered villages, cities or "fields" (5:14) they put the sick in the streets and besought him that they might touch the fringes (or tassels) of his garments (Deut. 22:12), and those who touched them were healed. This reminds one not only of 5:27, but of Acts 5:15, where, however, superstition has gone so far as to expect healing from a holy man's shadow. The material of 6:54–56 constitutes another "summary report" like 1:32–34 and 3:10–12, covering much activity in a generalized manner.

7:1–23 On the Washing of Hands (Mt. 15:1–20). For the sake of variety Mark now undertakes to show Jesus in controversy with his opponents, as in 3:23–30 (and 10:2–12). He has a compilation of sayings, which begins in 7:6 and for which he provides an introduction in vv. 1–5. The whole is, however, an artificially fashioned entity.

The Pharisees and some scribes lately arrived from Jerusalem come to Jesus, and observing that some of his disciples (those with Hellenistic names?) ate bread with "unclean" hands (which Mark explains means "unwashed"), they asked him the question of v. 5. Mark, however, has interrupted the first part of his sentence with a lengthy parenthetical explanation (vv. 3–4). The explanation is given for the benefit of Gentile readers unacquainted with Jewish customs; Matthew, writing for Jews, can omit it. "The Pharisees and all Jews," we are told, "do not eat unless they wash their hands with the fist" (Gr. *pygmḗ*). But the Jewish rules on the washing of hands (Heb. *neṭīlath yādayim*) make unlikely any use of the fist (which presumably would mean rubbing the palms with the fists). A variant reading (Codices S, D, W, Old Latin, Old Syriac) gives instead *pykná,* "often."

The rules prescribe that for ordinary mealtime purposes the pouring of water over the hands (before and after eating) should extend to the point where the fingers are joined to the hand (for ceremonial purposes: to the wrist). "To the fist" would describe that very well for Western readers familiar with boxing. Therein, Mark adds, they observe the "tradition of the elders." (Rabbinic sources speak of "the words" or "commandments of the elders") and consider tradition, Heb. *māsōreth,* a fence around the Old Testament law, just as there is a fence around the sacred area of the Temple. The scriptural justification was provided by Lev. 18:30.) When they come from the market place (Gr. *agorá*) they do not eat unless they purify themselves. For general information about the queer habits of the Jews, Mark adds that they also hold fast to many other things they have received: washings of cups (Gr. *xestēs,* really a measure of about a pint; > Latin: *sextarius*), pots, copper kettles (some texts add: tables). After the long parenthesis, Mark in v. 5 then ends the sentence that broke off in v. 2, but he is compelled for clarity's sake to repeat the subject "Pharisees and scribes."

vv. 6–8 Jesus replies with a bold attack on Pharisaic extension of Old Testament law by quoting Is. 29:13 (given in a text varying from known LXX manuscripts) as prophetic of the Pharisees. He charges that they disregard God's commandment and observe (instead) the traditions of men. This is a blanket rejection of traditionalism, where it runs counter to basic moral law, and really leads to the saying of vv. 10–11, instead of being a critique of the rather harmless, if inconvenient, Pharisaic washing of hands. Mark thus has prefixed vv. 1–5 artificially.

vv. 9–13 Mark's new introduction, "he said to them," suggests that he here is quoting another piece of source material. It evidently began with the same saying with which vv. 6–8 ended. Jesus then adduces an example; he cites a Commandment of God (= of the Old Testament law), combining Ex. 21:17 and 20:12. Honoring one's parents he takes as including the obligation to help them when they need support. No doubt this was a generally accepted principle, but Pharisaic lawyers had found a way for people to evade this duty if they so desired. If one said to the needy father or mother, "A Corban (Heb. *qorbān,* an "offering" brought at the Temple) shall that be which would have accrued to you from me," then the son or daughter was relieved of his or her obligation. There seems to have been an oath formula in connection with this (cf. Jos., *Apion, 1,* 22). Many similar casuistries, Jesus states, do they resort to. (An Aramaic ossuary inscription of the first century A.D. found near the Well of Job at Jerusalem and published in 1958 declares any valuables buried with the dead person "Corban of God," in the hope of deterring robbers.) Cf. the different use of the word as "treasury" in Mt. 27:6.

vv. 14–16 Mark now makes a fresh beginning to introduce the important saying of 7:15. Jesus summons the crowd and sets up the new principle that nothing entering into man from the outside defiles him—a belief of which Pharisaic rules made so much—but rather that which comes out of him (i.e., out of his mouth). This important saying receives two commentaries, vv. 17–19 and vv. 20–23, as indicated by their separate introductions.

vv. 17–19 The first is clearly esoteric, since given privately. When they were again "in a house" and apart from the crowd, the disciples, as in 4:10, ask for an explanation of "the parable" (i.e. parabolic saying). Jesus rebukes them for their lack of understanding. The commentary reasons thus: What enters through the mouth cannot defile, because it does not go into the heart, but rather into the stomach and thence into the colon (? Gr. *aphedrṓn* —an otherwise unknown Greek word but related to Gr. *hédra* "seat." The other possible rendering, "privy," is unlikely. It is a question whether one may not render "leaves the colon" on the basis of a supposed original Aram. *nefaq le*). The concluding words of v. 19, "purifying all foods," seem to hang in the air. It may be that the participle refers back to Jesus: "(so said he) declaring all foods clean." On the basis of the above mentioned Aramaic rendering, one might translate "which excretes all foods." But it must be admitted that this is presently one of those obscurities which cannot be convincingly clarified.

vv. 20–23 The second commentary on v. 15 reiterates part of it and then gives an elaboration of the more deplorable things that come from the heart of man. It is a list of four-times-three vices, the first six in the plural, the second six in the singular (for a memnotechnic purpose?), but otherwise not classified. They are: (1) fornications, thievings, murders; (2) adulteries, covetings, wickednesses (the last two also occur together in Rom. 1:29); (3) deceit, licentiousness, envy; (4) slander, pride, foolishness. Wrapping it up, Jesus repeats: "All these come from within and defile a man." Such lists played a role in pagan Hellenistic as well as in Hellenistic-Jewish ethical instruction and in a more limited way also at Qumran (cf. 1 QS, IV, 9 f.).

7:24–30 The Canaanite Woman (Mt. 15:21–28). This does not have the earmarks of either the brief or elaborate type of story, though in the version given by Matthew it belongs to the former. The heart of it is a dialogue between Jesus and the Canaanite woman. It is possible that Mark received only a dialogue and has reconstructed the entire setting, utilizing a report of a journey of Jesus to the region north of Galilee. This report was influenced, if not inspired, by the story of Elijah, who fled from his sovereign's territory to Phoenicia and found hospitality in a house at Zarephath (1 Kings 17:8 ff.). Perhaps the journey of Jesus was originally seen as occasioned by similar peril from Herod. A Jew of this period would have given great offense by lodging with Gentiles (cf. Acts 10:28). Matthew, writing for Jewish Christians, perforce takes heed of this and changes the beginning of the story (Mt. 15:22). It may have been to offset such objections that Mark introduced the preceding sayings about defilement.

Jesus, Mark says, entered a house in Phoenicia. He did not want anyone to know of his presence, but it could not be concealed. (The reason for this was carefully "planted" in 3:6 f.) Hearing about him a woman whose daughter had an "unclean spirit" came and fell down at his feet. She is described as a Greek (-speaking person), but by descent "Syro-Phoenician" (from Aramaic-speaking stock in Phoenicia? Codex D: Phoenician). She begs Jesus to cast out the demon. He rejects the idea, saying, "First permit the children (= the Jews) to be satisfied (with food)! It is not nice to take the bread of the children and throw it to the little dogs." (Gr. *kynária.* The "diminutive" word-form shows that no offense was intended by the comparison.) Jesus was not "proving" the woman; he was stating the nature of his mission in metaphoric speech. He was sent only to God's children—the Jewish people. The woman replies, "Yea, Lord (the only instance in Mark of the use of this title in direct address), and the little dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." Her skillful parrying and the faith implied in her persistence move him to make an exception. "For the sake of this word" he bids her go home and assures her that the demon has left the child. When she does this she finds the child lying on the bed (on which the demon had thrown her in departing). The narrative is singular in Mark with respect to healing at a distance (cf. Jn. 4:46 ff.).

7:31–37 The Healing of the Deaf and Dumb Man (Mt. 15:29–31)

v. 31 Mark now leads over to two incidents which he believes happened in the lake region. His "historical" narration is rather vague here. "Going forth again from the borders of Tyre, Jesus came through Sidon to the lake of Galilee into the midst of the borders of the Decapolis" (5:20). This is no plausible itinerary, even if one assumes that Sidon does not mean the city, but rather a strip of Sidonian hinterland extending eastward toward Mt. Hermon. It has been suggested that the tradition as received by Mark meant Bethsaida rather than Sidon, and this is rendered attractive by the fact that the story of 7:32 f. is related to 8:22 f., which is localized at Bethsaida. This was not clear to Mark, however, who takes Jesus into the Decapolis, halfway down the eastern shore of the lake and hence quite a distance from Bethsaida.

vv. 32–37 This piece belongs to the more elaborate type of story. It evidently began indefinitely, and without description of a situation; the incident thus could have happened anywhere. "They" (certain persons) brought a deaf and dumb man to Jesus and besought him to lay the hand upon him (to heal him). He took the man apart from the crowd, put his finger in the man's ears, and then after spitting (on his finger) also touched the man's tongue. Looking up to heaven he sighed and said to the man, *"Ephphathá,"* which Mark renders, "Be opened." The word is among those showing that Jesus spoke Aramaic; in more exact transcription it is *eppatach* (shortened from *ethpattach*). It applies most naturally to the opening of the eyes, but here is used of the ears. After Jesus spoke it "the man's ears were opened, and immediately the bond of his tongue was loosed and he could speak properly." The cure of the tongue was thus secondary, and was more the result of using the spittle. No mention is made of demon possession, though there could be a hint of it in the tongue's being bound (cf. 9:25 where it is mentioned and where Jesus addresses the demon). Jesus commanded them (i.e., those of v. 32) to tell this healing to no one (in accordance with the idea of keeping his Messiahship secret). But the more he commanded them, the more they proclaimed (on the spot, to people in reach). The story ends with mention of their amazement and the chorus praising God: "He has made all things well (hint of Gen. 1:31, LXX), the deaf he makes to hear, and the dumb to speak" (Is. 35:5–6). The primeval purpose is being realized as the fulfillment of eschatological prophecy commences.

This story, like its parallel 8:22 f., makes Jesus employ a wonder-working technique. The use of spittle, the looking up to heaven, the sighing, the uttering of a potent word, are all a part of it. One must suspect that Mark has included this story with an eye to instructing Christian miracle-doers (cf. 1 Cor. 12:28, 30) by the example of Jesus. From Josephus we know that the Jews of the first century had directions for exorcism, which were ascribed to King Solomon. He regards them as a sure cure, and relates how a man named Eleazar drove out a demon in the presence of Vespasian and the Roman soldiery (Jos., *Ant., 8,* 2, 5). It was most desirable for Christian healers to have some idea of suitable technique based on example set by Jesus, instead of using prescriptions from magical books.

8:1–10 The Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mt. 15:32–39). We here begin the cycle extending through 8:26, which parallels 6:34–7:37 (see p. 36) and is omitted by Luke. This first piece is obviously a counterpart of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. Mark's readiness to include a second feeding-miracle may be explained as due to a desire to buttress the credibility of the first. From the point of view of literary form one must say that this story does not have the characteristics of either the short or the more detailed type; 6:34–44, as we have seen, belonged to the latter class. Abridgment by Mark may be responsible for the loss of typical characteristics.

Mark establishes an artificial connection with the preceding incident by a simple "in those days." If a lake crossing originally preceded (cf. 8:10), as in 6:32 ff., he has omitted it owing to his bringing Jesus to the Decapolis on foot. He has crammed the situation-description into an introductory clause. Jesus then calls his disciples and says that he is moved with compassion for the people because they have been with him three days (symbolical?) without food. (In 6:36 his compassion leads him to teach, and the disciples call his attention to the needs of the people.) How can he dismiss them in this way? The disciples have no solution of the difficulty. Jesus inquires as to their supplies and learns that they have seven (6:38, five) loaves of bread. He commands the crowd to recline, then gives thanks, breaks the bread, and bids the disciples distribute it. On learning that they have a few (6:38, two) "little fishes" he speaks a blessing over them and directs that they, too, be served. The disciples collect seven (6:43, twelve) baskets full of fragments. The story gives the number fed as four thousand (6:44, five thousand *men*).

v. 10 The basic similarity of this connecting verse to the main facts of 6:45, 51, 53 is apparent. Mark can proceed more simply here because he does not have to fit in an incident of walking on the water. Jesus dismisses the people, gets immediately into the boat (the presence of which is surprising since he has come on foot from Phoenicia to the Decapolis), and crosses over to "the parts of Dalmanutha" (a name probably corrupted from *Magdala,* the home of the "Magdalene," 15:40; cf. the form given in Mt. 15:39). The healing ministry described in 6:54 f. is not repeated. Instead, Mark again confronts Jesus with his chief adversaries, the Pharisees.

8:11–13 The Pharisees Demand a Sign (Mt. 16:1–4; cf. 12:38–39; Lk. 11:16; 12:54–56; 11:29). There are some sayings of Jesus in the Gospels which are not part of a real story, but require and are provided with information about the occasion in which they were spoken. The saying of 8:12 is of this nature (cf. also Mk. 9:38–40; Mt. 8:19–22; 18:21–22). In this instance Mark may have created the situation. (That traditional knowledge may have helped him is, of course, perfectly possible.) Jesus had said: "Why does this generation seek a sign? None will be given them." It was easy to infer from this that some people had asked Jesus for a sign. The first people one would think of were the Pharisees, and so Mark attributed the request to them. However, this is none too convincing, since Jesus refers to "this generation" (cf. 1 Cor. 1:22), not to a few Pharisees. That the latter went forth and began to dispute with him, demanding a sign from heaven (cf. Mt. 16:1) to tempt him (10:2), is not a convincing situation. That Jesus sighed (Old Syriac: was excited) in the spirit (i.e., inwardly; cf. 2:8) at this attitude of mind of those seeking a sign harmonizes with the question, but could be Mark's inference.

Since the next piece Mark wants to introduce presupposes a boat situation, he establishes a connection by having Jesus leave the Pharisees and get into the boat to cross the lake again. It is, however, not the usual crossing in an easterly direction, for we next find him in the north at Bethsaida (7:21), east of the entrance of the Jordan into the lake of Galilee.

8:14–21 A Discourse on Leaven (Mt. 16:5–12; Lk. 12:1). This is evidently no traditional piece, but narration composed by Mark because it reflects on both stories of the feedings as here included. However, there is an older element in it: the saying of Jesus in 8:15. At one occasion he had warned his disciples, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod." (Leaven was considered impure, owing to the mysterious fermentation process; the word is thus used figuratively for wickedness.) The saying as Mark gives it is certainly original. It couples the Pharisees and Herod, as 3:6 did the Pharisees and the Herodians. Underlying this is the fact that Herod was seeking to get hold of Jesus as he had got hold of John (cf. Lk. 13:31).

Mark makes this a comment of Jesus at an occasion when the disciples had only one loaf of bread along (after 8:5 they should not have any loaf left—manifest proof of how events that occurred at different times have been linked artificially). The saying stands rather inorganically in its connection, as it receives no attention from the disciples. They merely carried on a discussion (R.S.V.: discussed it) about having no bread. Jesus allegedly intervenes, asking why they are discussing this. Do they not yet understand (who he is, viz., the Son of God)? Do they have a hardened heart? He quotes Is. 6:9 as applying to them (cf. 4:12) and asks how many baskets of fragments they gathered at the feedings of 6:35 f. and 8:1 f.? (Mark thus skillfully makes the reader believe that the two versions of the feeding of a multitude were separate incidents.) Jesus repeats: Do they still not understand? Mark is describing Jesus as trying to bring the disciples to the point of making the Messianic confession. The two feeding-miracles provided especially strong proof that God's power was with him. It is noteworthy that in the parallel version of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus eludes the crowd out of fear that they would "take him by force to make him king" (Jn. 6:15). In one way or another Messianism is involved in the feeding miracles.

8:22–26 The Blind Man of Bethsaida. This story of the elaborate type, which terminates the block of parallel material comprising 8:1–26, begins with an arrival at Bethsaida. The allusion is to the old fishing village and not to the Hellenistic city of Julias into which it was supposedly converted by Philip (Jos., *Ant., 18,* 2, 1). How and why Jesus went to this place was no part of the originally independent tale. "They"—presumably some of the villagers—bring a blind man to Jesus, asking him to heal the man. Jesus takes him by the hand and leads him out of the village. (Presumably there was originally a command not to follow, as presupposed in 7:33.) The reason for this is that again there is going to be a manifestation of divine power, which is not for the eyes of the curious. In this story as in 7:32 ff., of which it is a variant, we find Jesus resorting to a technique. First of all he spits into the man's eyes. The use of spittle is particularly appropriate, since in rabbinic sources it is referred to as healing agent in eye trouble (cf. also Jn. 9:6). Next Jesus puts his hands on him (on his eyes? cf. v. 25). One misses the utterance of a potent word; perhaps Mark did not want to repeat the *Ephphatha* of 7:34. This leaves the spittle and the laying on of hands the only curative factors. Jesus then asks the man if he (now) can see anything. The man looks up and says that he can see men (moving about); they look to him like walking trees. (In a pagan account of the healing of a blind man at an Asklepios sanctuary, the man first sees the trees.) The cure as yet being no full success Jesus again puts his hands on the man's eyes. The latter now "looks through" (i.e., his glance penetrates) and he is restored (with respect to his sight) and sees everything clearly. Jesus then sends him home, saying: "Do not come into the village." This would seem to imply that the man lived elsewhere. But the verse is probably Mark's addition to the story; Jesus is portrayed as trying to keep these healings secret (cf. 5:43a, 7:36).

The story gave valuable hint to early Christian healers as to technique and the need of repetition of the procedure, if full success was not attained at once. But the wonder-working of the early days was receding. Hence Matthew and Luke omit this story. The former had enough of this kind of thing in using 7:31–37, and the latter no doubt rejected it because it contained no saying of Jesus that was of religious value, and portrayed him as using methods akin to those employed by Jewish and pagan healers. It is possible that Mark saw a special appropriateness in this story in view of the Messianic theme that he now turns to. Opening of the eyes of the blind was prophesied in Is. 61:1, LXX (cf. Lk. 4:18) but not in the Hebrew, which reads "to prisoners opening."

8:27–33 The Messianic Confession of Peter; The First Passion Announcement; Peter Rebuked (Mt. 16:13–23; Lk. 9:18–22). The material does not fit into the pattern of either type of independent story used by Mark. It is "historical" reporting. The incident related is connected with a journey to the villages belonging to the city of Caesarea Philippi. Jesus is thus traveling in Philip's tetrarchy, away from that of his sovereign Herod Antipas. In those days a road must have gone from Philip's city of Julias to his summer residence at Caesarea, formerly called Paneas, fifty Roman miles to the north. On the way Jesus posed the question to his disciples, "Who do men say I am?" He was told, "John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets." The actions of Jesus, therefore, did not lead people to regard him as Messiah. The latter was conceived of as the exalted warrior, liberator, and future king of the Hebrew people. It was expected, however, that the Messiah would be preceded by one or more prophets of old, come back to earth. There was speculation whether he was one of these as well as whether he was the Baptist. (In 6:14 this was the view of Herod.) Jesus now asked the disciples "Who do *you* say that I am?" Peter answered, "You are the Christ." He naturally uttered this in his native Aramaic tongue as *Meshīḥā,* in Greek transcription *Messias,* Jn. 4:25. Mark does not give a comment or reply by Jesus. He merely relates that he charged them to mention (this) about him *to no one.*

The fact that Jesus does not openly approve of the saying of Peter raises the question whether he actually entertained Messianic aspirations. It should probably be answered with both No and Yes. So far as one can see he showed no interest in royalty, nationalism, political and military action, without which there could be no "Anointed of the Lord" in the accepted sense. On the other hand, he was conscious of living at the turning point of the ages and of having a divine mission corresponding in importance to what the ancient hope had ascribed to the Messiah. If he regarded Deutero-Isaiah's prophecies of the Servant of the Lord as referring to the Messiah (and perhaps requiring fulfillment before the prophecies of a kingly Messiah could be realized), then he could have considered himself the Messiah. At the same time, the ordinary, political view of the Messiahship, which was shared by such a religious group as the sectarians of Qumran, made any use of the title perilous. It is worthy of note that the Passion announcement immediately follows. Mark's purpose evidently is to counteract at once any suspicion that Jesus wanted to be a political Messiah. Whatever may have been Jesus' own attitude, those who made no such differentiation between a stage of humiliation and a later stage of glorification, but looked only for a political Messiah, could pin on him the accusation of would-be Messiah, and hence a revolutionary.

This Passion announcement is the first of three (the others: 9:30–32; 10:32–34). It is typical of all of them that they are not reported in old stories, but are "historical" narration by the author. The wording suggests that this is not a single, clear-cut occasion, but represents, as it were, a course of instruction. "He *began to* teach them (and continued to do so) that it is *necessary*" (Gr. *dei*) for the *Son of man* to suffer many things." This necessity is, of course, based on the will of God as expressed in Old Testament prophecy. The introduction of the phrase "Son of man" is important here. If Jesus had not suffered he would not have been elevated to heaven and could not come from there as the Son of man of Dan. 7:13. If he said no more than this, it implied his determination to go to Jerusalem (cf. Lk. 13:33). It is possible, of course, that Jesus used a simple "it is necessary for me to suffer" and that "Son of man" is Mark's contribution, based on the theology he espouses. Indeed, it may have been his intention to introduce the "Son of man" mystery for the first time at this point (cf. further 10:45). He may have retained the title in 2:10 and 28 because he found it in these received stories. The rest of the saying of v. 31, however, puts into the mouth of Jesus exact prediction of what we know from the Passion narrative—his rejection (cf. 12:10) by elders, high priests and scribes, and his resurrection "after three days" (9:31; 10:34; Mt. and Lk.: on the third day). He thus spoke the Word (i.e., the gospel of 2:2, but in this case perhaps already the gospel in the Christian sense?) freely (i.e., openly). There must be some truth in the idea that Jesus uttered a premonition about his own fate, for without that the incident that now follows, and which seems beyond invention, would hang in the air.

vv. 32b–33 Peter took Jesus aside and began to rebuke him (for entertaining thoughts so contrary to his idea of a Messiah). But turning and looking at his disciples (by way of including them), Jesus rebuked Peter, saying, "Get thee behind me Satan, for thou dost not think the things of God, but those of men" (cf. Rom. 8:5). (Get thee behind me hardly means "fall in line" as in 2 Kings 9:19, since Satan cannot be imagined as following; the emphasis is on "get," meaning "go." "Go behind" is an Aramaic idiom, reflected in Jn. 6:66; 18:6; 20:14. Perhaps the "me" was improperly added here. The Sinaitic Syriac of Mt. 4:10 reads "get thee behind thyself," meaning "go away.") At this moment Peter is to him the incarnation of the tempter, and is dismissed as the Devil is in Mt. 4:10.

8:34–9:1 The Disciples' Path of Suffering (Mt. 16:24–28; Lk. 9:23–27). This is an important piece, according to Mark's intention. Not only did Jesus, after being given the Messianic title, introduce the totally revised expectation of a suffering Messiah, but he taught that his followers, too, must be willing to suffer. Jesus summons the crowd (strangely present in the situation of 8:27) "with his disciples" to address this instruction to them. The crowd is perhaps symbolic of the Christian believers for whom Mark is writing.

v. 34 Jesus says that if anyone wants

to "come behind him" (= follow Jesus) let him deny himself and take up his cross: so will he follow him (i.e., really be Jesus' disciple; cf. Lk. 14:27). This could scarcely have been spoken by Jesus, since his crucifixion was not foreseeable to his hearers at this time—the Passion announcements not being understood (and actually only a literary invention). The saying was formed in the light of the crucifixion, and perhaps also in the light of the martyrdom of Peter, if the ancient Roman tradition that he, too, was crucified has any truth in it. In Jn. 21:19, 22, the command to Peter to follow Jesus and the hint as to the manner of his death point in the same direction. (It has been suggested that "taking up the cross" in v. 34 means receiving the sign of the cross, without any relation to the crucifixion idea, but as mark of belonging to Christ and to the eschatological congregation; cf. Ezek. 9:4 where the prophet is told to put a letter *tāw*—which was a cross in old Hebrew script—on the foreheads of men. Cf. Is. 44:5. But the LXX renders *tāw* with "sign." Gospel authors would probably have done so too, had this been their idea of the meaning, and not rendered it "cross.")

v. 35 The second saying is in the proverbial vein: "Whoever wants to save his soul (= life) will lose it, and whoever loses it *for my sake and the gospel's* will save it." In the parallel passages, Mt. 16:25, Lk. 9:24, the reference to the gospel is not found. (But even the "for my sake" is missing in Lk. 17:33.) Mark probably has added it to make clear to the Christian reader that this concerns him—not only the men who were Jesus' companions. The "saving" of life refers to escape from the judgment. It is promised to those who suffer martyrdom.

vv. 36–37 Two rhetorical questions were put here because they also speak of the soul or life. The first, What profiteth it a man to win the whole world and lose his soul (= his life)? is not just meant in the superficial sense; cf. the rabbinic dictum, "Who keeps a word of the law preserves his soul, and who destroys a word of the law destroys his soul." The loss of eternal life is implied. The second question, What ransom may a man *give* for his life? echoes Ps. 49:7, in which the meaning was merely that in the hour of death God accepts no payment to extend one's life. As used here, however, the thought is of ransom from the final Judgment.

v. 38 Mark puts here the important saying that whoever is ashamed of Jesus and his words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. The saying is perhaps the only Marcan one containing the phrase "Son of man" in which that term is not suspect, for it is buttressed by its immediate parallel (Lk. 9:26; cf. Mt. 16:27) and also by Lk. 12:8–9. (In Mt. 10:32–33, the parallel to the latter passage, Jesus speaks in the first person, but this represents an arbitrary change by Matthew; cf. on that passage.) The saying has undergone remodeling and expansion. The use of "ashamed of" has probably been substituted for "deny" (cf. Lk. 12:9; Mt. 10:33) owing to a preference for the word at a certain time and in a certain group (cf. Rom. 1:16). It is an expansion, as the same parallels show if reference is made to the *words* of Jesus, as something of which one might be ashamed; this hardly means the gospel about Christ, which was meant in v. 35 and of which Paul said he was not ashamed, but rather the teachings of Jesus, as Mark has presented them. The allusion to this "adulterous and sinful generation" (in which "sinful" is an interpretative addition for the benefit of those who did not understand that "adulterous" is meant figuratively, as disloyalty to God, Hos. 2:5) is also an addition, as is likewise evident from Lk. 12:9. The element about "coming in the glory of the Father with the holy angels" (cf. 13:27) is not to be relied upon either; in Lk. 12:9 the Son of man will deny *"before* the angels of God" (in Mt. 10:33, before his Father in heaven). However, the evidence for the use of "Son of man" by Jesus in this saying is strong. Much has been made of the fact that Jesus does not directly identify himself here with the Son of man, yea that he differentiates himself from him. It has been argued that Christians who discovered a justification for a hope of the return of Jesus in Dan. 7:13 first made the identification of the Son of man with Jesus and carried the use of the phrase back into the Gospel story, even putting it into the mouth of Jesus as a present self-designation (cf. on 2:10). But if the theory were correct it seems doubtful whether the saying of 8:38 should be used in support of it. The "also" in the second half of the saying ties both halves together in a manner indicating that the subject is the same.

9:1 With an Amen-saying, Jesus predicts that some of those standing there will not "taste death" (cf. Jn. 8:52; Heb. 2:9; a metaphor derived from the poisoned cup?) until they have seen the kingdom of God coming in power. Matthew revises this and speaks of the kingdom of the Son of man (Mt. 16:28). The saying seems authentic, and finds its last echo in Jn. 21:22, where there is at least one lone survivor. Mark here finds a powerful conclusion for the sayings on discipleship.

9:2–8 The Transfiguration (Mt. 17:1–8; Lk. 9:28–36). In this strange story two things must be considered—first, its function in the book, and then, its classification. If one recognizes the Messianic confession of 8:27–30 as the turning point in Mark's account of Jesus' ministry, and the first Passion announcement with the attached discipleship sayings as a correction of the traditional Messianism just voiced by Peter, then this story does two things: it puts God's seal of approval *on this corrected view* and gives an advance revelation of the resurrection state of Jesus. (That he will rise again is the decisive and triumphant element in the Passion announcement.) The Transfiguration story thus represents the climax of the story of Jesus' ministry.

From the point of view of classification, this story thus far has counterparts only in the Baptism and the Temptation. In all three a transcendent factor (the so-called "mythological element") plays a role. It is most akin to the Baptism story. The latter provided a revelation for Jesus alone, while this—at least in its present form and position—is intended for the three leading disciples.

The initial "after six days" is puzzling. If taken literally, it leaves a large gap in the record. It could be an Old Testament allusion, suggested by the six days that Moses had to wait until God spoke to him from the cloud (Ex. 24:16). Even better, perhaps, is the thought that the six days symbolize the Passion week. Jesus takes Peter and the two sons of Zebedee up a very high mountain. It no doubt is the one called "the holy mount" in 2 Pet. 1:18, which in turn is identical with the one of Mt. 28:16. (Later tradition identified it with Tabor, but that mountain bore a fortress, Jos., *B. J., 4,* 1, 8, and a heathen shrine, and would scarcely have attracted Jesus. Mt. Hermon is too remote for the scene in 9:14 f. and lay in a wilderness from the west. The *Jebel Jermak,* highest peak of Galilee, situated near Meron, where Jewish lore of a later day expected the Messiah to appear is a more logical candidate.) In the privacy of the mountaintop Jesus was "transfigured" before them. The narrator hesitates to say anything about his body. His garments became shining, very white. (Mark's naïve comparison with what a "fuller" can achieve with linen is not taken over by Matthew or Luke and has even been revised here by Codex D, the Old Latin, and Old Syriac.) Next, Elijah appeared, along with Moses, who was also held to have been translated (a thought that inspired an author of the time of Christ to write a work called *The Assumption of Moses*). Peter addresses Jesus, whom he here calls "Rabbi" (as he again does in 11:21) with the remark, "It is good that we are here, and we will make three booths, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias." This seems to be a motif drawn from the feast of the Tabernacles, a particularly joyful festival, at which it was customary to camp out in booths (Heb. *sukkōth;* Gr. *skēnaí*). With that celebration was associated the idea of God's kingship, and other Messianic lore. The narrative seems to imply that Peter was in an ecstatic state; in v. 6 the narrator apologizes for him: "For he did not know what he was saying. For they were in great fear." Rather strangely, Matthew does not have this verse, and Luke has only the first part of it. It seems probable that the words "for they were in great fear" are an addition by Mark, for they clash with Peter's apparent satisfaction at seeing Jesus conversing with the two greatest religious personages of the Hebrew past. He spoke "out of order," interrupting a situation that was still developing.

A reply by Jesus is rendered superfluous by what then happens: a cloud appears and overshadows them (Old Syriac: "him"; cf. Lk. 1:35). This cloud is indicative of the presence of the deity (cf. Ex. 40:28 f.; in predictive prophecy Is. 4:5; 2 Macc. 2:8). God's voice now speaks from it, giving the disciples the revelation Jesus had received at the Baptism (1:11), but omitting the "election" element and adding instead the command (based on Deut. 18:15) "hear him" (i.e., this prophet like Moses). Not only does this identify Jesus to these disciples as the Son of God, it also puts divine authority behind his further teaching (particularly the Passion announcements?). In a twinkling the cloud and the celestial visitors disappear. Looking about, the disciples saw no one but Jesus alone with them (changed back to his normal appearance).

This occasion is also referred to in 2 Pet. 1:16–18, which describes the heavenly voice *as addressing Jesus* (with the "election" element and without the "hear him"), and thus is not dependent on the Synoptic version. Furthermore, that passage seems to imply that the author of 2 Pet. is thinking of the risen Christ. The theory entertained by some scholars that Mk. 9:2–8 is derived from a resurrection story can thus be defended, but one must then suppose that it has been enriched with other elements and deprived of the main one—the absence and reappearance of Christ. Other scholars have taken the story as an account of a real visionary experience of Peter and have used it to explain how Peter came to be the original witness of the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:5)—he was subject to visionary experiences (cf. also Acts 10:9 f.).

However, this psychological approach cannot be carried through with material of such uncertain dependability. It seems preferable to hew to the line of form criticism and to take this story as manifestation of the divine nature of Jesus (an "Epiphany" narrative). It has, however, a special angle that deserves to be noticed. We speak of the incident described in it as the Transfiguration because the word "transfigured" is used in v. 2. This is an echo of the Latin Bible's translation *"transfiguratus est."* The Greek word so rendered was *"metemorphṓthē,"* "he was metamorphosed." That was a significant concept when Mark wrote. Ovid's most famous work, completed in A.D. 8, bears the title *Metamorphoses*. In giving a presentation of the beautiful mythology of the Greeks, this Roman poet saw the theme of metamorphosis running through it: the myths told of men being turned into objects or animals by gods, of souls taking on new forms after death, and of gods assuming any earthly guise they chose. That Jesus was temporarily metamorphosed from an ordinary body into the glorified body, and back again into the natural body, is thus an important element in this narrative. This is a preview of his resurrection state. It is also a substitute for a narrative of resurrection experiences, which Mark does not intend to relate. Peter's leading role here echoes that which he had held in connection with the first appearance of Christ (1 Cor. 15:5).

9:9–13 Conversation during the Descent from the Mount (Mt. 17:9–13)

v. 9 In "historical" narration Mark states that on the descent from the mount Jesus commanded the three disciples to tell no one (not even their fellow disciples) what they had seen until the Son of man had risen from the dead. It is basically the same command as in 8:30, but with a time limit. The Messianic confession of men has been replaced with the God's acknowledgment of Jesus as his beloved Son, whose message is authoritative. Since the experience on the mount was limited to three intimates, they later were authority for this story. Presumably their claim of privileged position among the whole group of the disciples was buttressed by their ability to give information the others did not have.

v. 10 The three disciples "took up" the saying (R.S.V.: "kept the matter to themselves," which does not fit, since that would look beyond the moment), considering (together) what the "rising from the dead" meant (with reference to the Son of man).

vv. 11–13 They asked Jesus, saying: "(What about this) that the scribes say that Elias must (Gr. *dei,* expressing the divinely ordained necessity) come first and restore all things?" The mention of this is surprising. In a document in which a writer digests his material, reference would certainly have to be made to the fact that Elijah had just appeared in the Transfiguration scene. It is obvious, therefore, that this is completely independent material, which Mark has put here editorially.

Jesus replies that (Scripture indeed says that) Elijah, coming first, restores all things. But how then can it be written of the Son of man that he must suffer much and be despised? (If the second Elijah effects the change of heart in men that the prediction of Mal. 4:5–6 implies, then there can be no such villainy as will cause the Son of man to suffer.) Scripture thus seemingly contradicts Scripture (which is impossible). Jesus gives the solution of the difficulty by cutting the Gordian knot. With a "but I say unto you" (authoritative as in Mt. 5:22, etc.) he asserts: "Elijah *has* come (in the person of John the Baptist; cf. Mt. 11:14; 17:13) and they did to him what they wished, as is written of him" (in some unknown Apocalypse? cf. Rev. 11:2 f.?). He could not restore all things, because the Jews did not permit him to do so. (What is written about his fate thus modifies Mal. 4:5–6.) The unspoken conclusion is: Since the forerunner's ministry has ended, the prophecies about the Son of man can now be fulfilled. With the Son of man prophecy of Dan. 7:13 is evidently associated the prophecy concerning the Servant of the Lord, Is. 53; the two figures are held identical. It is a question whether this passage is not the product of Christian theological reflection, which sought to face and master doubts that arose in Christian minds about such a presentation as is given in 1:1 f. But even if vv. 9–13 are a compilation they revert excellently to the mood of the Passion after the ethereal scene of the Transfiguration.

9:14–29 The Healing of an Epileptic Boy (Mt. 17:14–21; Lk. 9:37–43a). Mark now introduces a miracle story of the more elaborate type. He has closely connected it with the return from the mount. But originally it must have presupposed the Capernaum locality (v. 28) which is not reached until 9:33. The story, however, implies a temporary absence of Jesus from the disciples (cf. 6:46; Lk. 6:12). They see (originally: he sees?) a crowd about the disciples, and scribes arguing with them (originally: the disciples arguing with each other?). When the crowd saw Jesus they were astonished (by his appearance? cf. Ex. 34:35; or at his arrival at this juncture?) and ran to greet him. He asked them (i.e., the disciples) what they were discussing with them (originally: with each other?).

vv. 17–20 One from the crowd now spoke up. Addressing Jesus as "teacher," he relates that he had brought his son to him. The boy has a "speechless spirit" (in v. 25 he is also deaf—perhaps an addition). In v. 18 the man gives a description of the affliction as he understands it. The demon pursues the boy and occasionally seizes him and rends him back and forth (or beats him to the ground?); the boy foams at the mouth, gnashes his teeth and "withers" (becomes livid? loses weight?). He then relates that (in the absence of Jesus) he had asked the disciples to cast out the demon—they had been given power over the demons in 6:7—but that they were not able to do so. Jesus complains of the unbelieving generation (i.e., everybody, including the disciples) and asks how long he can endure being in their midst (and not return to heaven)? Thus for a moment another glimpse of his divine nature is afforded; he is a stranger on the earth and longs to return to his heavenly home. He then commands the boy to be brought to him. The spirit throws the boy into a convulsion.

vv. 21–27 In the manner of a physician, Jesus now inquires into the history of the boy's condition; the father relates that his son has had it since childhood and that the spirit often casts him into fire or water (as though) to destroy him. To his appeal for aid Jesus replies that all things are possible to him who believes. The father declares, "I believe; help my unbelief." (This genuine religious element is exceptional in the elaborate stories, but characteristic of the brief ones. It thus is an instance of one type influencing another.) Seeing the crowd coming (which either means that more people kept arriving or implies that Jesus had in some unexplained way taken the boy and his father aside, cf. 7:33; 8:

23), he now exorcises the spirit by addressing him directly as speechless [and dumb?] spirit, and commanding him to go forth and never to return. The spirit goes forth, crying out and shaking the boy. The boy lies as though dead, so that the crowd thinks he has actually expired. But Jesus takes him by his hand (cf. 5:41) and raises him up, and he stands up.

vv. 28–29 One would expect some concluding mention of a reaction of the boy (cf. 5:15) or of his father or of the crowd. But this is bypassed to get to the point of the story: it began with the failure of the disciples to cast out the demon and it ends with an explanation of this. When Jesus had entered the house (in Capernaum?) the disciples asked him about the matter. He declared that this kind (of demon) cannot be driven out except by prayer and fasting. (Codices S and B omit "fasting" and are followed therein by the R.S.V.; but abridgment is easier to understand than augmentation). The emphasis on fasting is surprising in view of 2:19 (where, however, the way was prepared for the reintroduction of fasting by the Church), and the Jesus of this Gospel does not particularly stress prayer. Both prayer and fasting, however, are cardinal things in Pharisaic piety.

The shaping of this story suggests that it contains procedural instruction for exorcism for the missionaries sent out by the Jerusalem church. They were evidently not always successful. The blame for that is put on themselves. Some demons, too, are harder to drive out than others, and the most effective exorcists are those who pray and fast a great deal. A professional attitude is to be taken in a case when a patient is already thought dead. What Jesus said and did is to be emulated.

9:30–32 The Second Passion Announcement (Mt. 17:22–23; Lk. 9:43b–45). Mark continues with "historical" narration. "Departing from there they went through Galilee and he did not wish that anyone should know." He thus thinks of Jesus as continuing his peregrinations, but they are made rather purposeless if he was maintaining an incognito. The latter is explained by the continuation "for he taught his disciples." Mark here is giving an improbable reason. The real one no doubt was the danger of arrest by Herod. This was an eventuality Jesus wished to avoid. As Paul later wanted to face trial in Rome, so Jesus wanted to face it—if at all—in Jerusalem.

As contents of Jesus' teaching of the disciples, Mark gives the second of the three Passion announcements (cf. 8:31–32a; 10:32–34), merely stating that the Son of man will be given over (by divine decree; cf. 1:14) into the hands of men (purposely left vague until 10:33), who will kill him, but that after three days he will arise. The disciples did not understand the saying, but were afraid to ask Jesus (to explain it). They now were filled with awe because of his manner (cf. 10:32).

9:33–37 The Dispute concerning Rank (Mt. 18:1–5; Lk. 9:46–48)

vv. 33–35 Jesus now comes to Capernaum. That he wished to remain unknown (9:30) is lost sight of; here, certainly, there was no way of concealing the fact of his presence. Entering the house (Peter's? cf. 1:29; 2:1; etc.) Jesus inquires about a conversation carried on by the disciples. (As teacher he had walked ahead, the disciples following at a respectful distance.) They remain silent, for, as Mark explains, they had been discussing the matter of who was the greatest (in the coming kingdom? in the Church? cf. 10:35 ff. and Mt. 16:18). Jesus is aware of what had gone on. He seats himself to teach, calls the Twelve (who were already with him in v. 33), and instructs them: He who would be first should be the one to take the role of the least and serve all. The incident ends here, and is thus not a clear-cut, independent story. Perhaps Mark had only the saying of Jesus in 9:35 in his source material, and supplied a narrative introduction.

vv. 36–37 Mark runs on as though this were still the same situation. But the purpose of this piece is different. It is not a lesson in humility, but instruction on receiving children. It seems to be another and less original version of the story given in 10:13–16. Taking a child, Jesus set it "in their midst" (i.e., of the group with him) and embracing it said to them that whoever receives one of such children in his name (i.e., the name Jesus Christ, 1:1) receives him [and whoever receives him receives not him but him who sent him]. This is clearly spoken for the situation in which Jesus is no longer with them (i.e., for the Primitive Church), and ends in a statement which is obviously "theological." What is meant by the receiving of children is not made entirely clear. The word "receive" frequently applies to hospitality, and the statement could refer to, and be part and parcel of, what is meant in Mt. 25: 35 ff. Or it could mean accepting their presence at ecclesiastical occasions, which mothers could attend only by bringing them along. Again it seems probable that what Mark had available was the saying of v. 37a.

9:38–41 The Strange Exorcist (Lk. 9:49–50)

vv. 38–40 Like 8:11–13 this is a case in which a saying of Jesus has been prefaced by a report of its occasion. It begins rather surprisingly with "and John said to him." As we know from Gal. 2:9 (cf. Acts 3:1 ff.) this disciple was an important person in the first decade of the early Church. This may have been taken from a collection of sayings of Jesus assembled by John's adherents. The disciples had seen someone "who does not follow us" casting out demons in Jesus' name, but had forbidden him to do so. Jesus replied that they should not forbid him. For there is no one who will do a (deed of) power in his *name* who will be able speedily to speak evil of him. The thought is underlined with a proverbial saying: Whoever is not against us is for us (given conversely and in connection with the Beelzebul controversy in Mt. 12:30; Lk. 11:23).

v. 41 This saying (differently placed in Mt. 10:42) is attached here partly because it contains the key word "name" and partly because of the thought that outsiders can under certain circumstances be a valuable help. They can for example give persecuted Christians a cup of water "in the name of Christ" (i.e., on the ground that they are of Christ; cf. 1 Cor. 3:23). With an Amen-saying Jesus predicts that such persons will be rewarded. In its present form this saying presupposes Christian experience of kindness on the part of humane nonconfessors.

9:42–48 About Offenses (Mt. 18:6–9; cf. Lk. 17:1–2). A small collection of sayings, extending through 8:50, is now adduced. The only thing binding them together is the association of ideas indicated by the use of key words. In vv. 42–48 it is the phrase "to give offense" (Gr. *skandalízein,* literally "cause to stumble" by laying a snare).

v. 42 This concerns giving offense to "little ones," i.e., causing them to fall. In subject matter the saying originally referred to children; the wrath behind the prediction accords with the protection Jesus gives the little child: whoever causes one of them to fall might better have an ass' millstone (an upper one, rotated by animal power) put about his neck, and be cast into the sea (than to face the divine judgment). Mark, however, by adding to "little ones" the words *"that believe in me"* has allegorized the saying to make it apply to adults who are still "little ones" in Christian status.

vv. 43–48 The rest of this material concerns the things in their own constitution that cause men to stumble. The Marcan form of the sayings differs slightly from that of Matthew. He has separate sayings on the offending hand and foot, whereas in Matthew they are fused (though in Mt. 5:29 ff. where related sayings are given from Q, the procedure is as here). In v. 43 Jesus speaks of "going away to Gehenna, to the unquenchable fire" (Mt.: "being cast into the eternal fire"). This is the only mention in Mark of Gehenna, which at this time had become the name for an underworldly or otherworldly place of punishment. The name is derived from *gē-hinnōm,* or the vale of Hinnom at Jerusalem (cf. Neh. 11:30). (Vv. 44 and 46 of A.V., which are based on Is. 66:24, are omitted in some leading manuscripts such as Codices S and B and in some versions.) In v. 47 Jesus speaks of entering *the kingdom of God,* instead of *entering into life* (v. 43), which reading Matthew offers in this particular saying. Here the allusion to Is. 66:24 appears again and enjoys strong textual support; "the worm that does not die" is figurative for the body's decay, which is imagined as continuing in spite of the fire of Gehenna (double torture). Matthew does not have this, but speaks merely of being cast into "the Gehenna of fire." This seems more plausible for a saying. An allusion to fire, in one form or another, however, is necessary (cf. below).

9:49–50 On Salt (Mt. 5:13; Lk. 14:34–35). Two further sayings are loosely attached here—the first because the key word "fire" occurred in it, as in v. 48; the second is added because "salt" is mentioned in the first. It seems likely that this arrangement existed already in the source from which Mark drew them.

v. 49 That all (= everyone) shall be salted with fire may just be a mixed metaphor, originally meaning no more than "be seasoned with suffering" (cf. Ecclus. 2:5) and thus made pleasing to God (Mt. 5:13). (A suggested emendation to "whatever would spoil is salted," based on supposed misunderstanding of the original Aramaic words, is unnecessary and improbable.) The continuation "and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (cf. Lev. 2:13) is very uncertain, as there is much divergence with respect to it in the manuscripts; if authentic it merely adds an illustration to what is meant by the main statement. Mark's idea in adducing the saying in v. 49 may have been that everyone (meaning the transgressors referred to) will be subjected to the fire of Gehenna.

v. 50a Salt here has an entirely different import, as a valuable commodity. The question, If salt has become saltless by what will you renew its flavor? is, however, a strange one. A similar saying appears in Aramaic form in a passage of the Talmud, as a question asked by wise men at Rome of a Jewish rabbi of A.D. 90. Some believe that the Talmudic passage is derogatory of Jesus, and that this is an intentional quotation. The idea of salt becoming saltless would scarcely have originated with a Roman. There is a Palestinian explanation for such a saying. The salt in common use was mixed with gypsum or with magnesium (the latter where it was obtained from marshes), and when the saline element evaporated through exposure to dampness, a mass was left that could be regarded as salt that had become saltless. See Lk. 14:35 for the use made of this residue. The point of the saying is that if a disciple loses his fitness to serve the cause of the betterment of society he cannot regain it. The rivalry of v. 34 posed such a danger.

v. 50b The concluding admonition, also put here because of the key word "salt," is without parallel in the other Synoptics. The joining of two thoughts, "have salt with you" and "keep peace" (Paul's language? cf. 1 Thess. 5:13), is puzzling. But actually the two are related for the Eastern mind (cf. the "covenant of salt," Num. 18:19, Lev. 2:13, between God and his people through the sacrificial communion; also the Arab saying after establishing fellowship with a meal: "There is salt between us"). Some interpreters allegorize "having salt" to mean "having humility," thus creating a relationship between 50a and 50b. But perhaps Mark just placed this saying here to bring the reader back to the starting point of v. 34 (friction between the disciples).

The materials of 9:30–50 thus serve the important function of educating the disciples, who are still imbued with worldly ideas, to a more Christian attitude of mind.

PART II THE JUDAEAN PERIOD

10:1–15:47 (Mt. 19–27; Lk. 18:15–23:56)

A. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

10:1–52 (Mt. 19–20; Lk. 18:15–19:27)

10:1–12 Marriage and Divorce (Mt. 19:1–12)

v. 1 Mark, with a single transitional verse, indicates that a new chapter in the ministry of Jesus is beginning. From the remote and isolated Galilee ruled by Herod Antipas, Jesus now transfers his activities to the regions that were under direct rule of a Roman governor residing at the coastal city of Caesarea and responsible to the legate of Syria, who resided at Antioch. "Rising up from there" (i.e., Capernaum, 9:33) Jesus comes "to Judaea *and* the other side of the Jordan." (Codex D, the Old Latin and the Old Syriac omit "and," interpreting as does Mt. 19:1 "to [that part of] Judaea on the other side of the Jordan," i.e., Peraea.) The Peraean ministry is nowhere visible in any incident Mark has included. Jesus could have kept along the western side of the Jordan. But Mark's information on itineraries is vague. Since the materials he adduces in 10:2–31 give no indications of time or place there is nothing to support Mark's placement of them. They may actually all have belonged to the ministry in Galilee. However, they serve to give the Peraean ministry independent standing and substance. The materials help to enrich Mark's presentation of the teachings of Jesus as such. Those on divorce, children, wealth, and discipleship come up in quick succession.

vv. 2–9 Divorce was a live question for a religious society such as the Church. What had the Lord said about it? Mark relates a discussion on this subject, allegedly provoked by Pharisees, who came to Jesus with a question, "trying him" (a phrase not in the A.V. nor the R.S.V., but contained in the best manuscripts). They ask whether it is lawful to divorce one's wife. The question was a theoretical one, since the individual marriage contract made provision for this eventuality. It seems more probable that such a question was raised in the Church on grounds of ethical sensitivity rather than by Pharisaic "lawyers." Jesus allegedly replied with a counterquestion as to what Moses had commanded them. He certainly did not need to be told that—the question is purely a device on the narrator's part to bring in the pertinent quotation of Deut. 24:1, which permitted a man to give his wife a (written) bill of divorce (and therewith to dismiss her).

Jesus answers that Moses had given this ordinance only because of their "hardness of heart" (same word in Gr. as "stubborn of heart" in Ezek. 3:7, LXX); i.e., Moses gave legal sanction to it, not because he approved of it, but because it was all he could do in view of his people's attitude in this matter. To show that this was not Moses' own position Jesus reverts to Moses' (supposed) account of the institution of marriage (Gen. 1:27), which began with one man and one woman, and to the declaration in Gen. 2:24 that a man shall cleave to his wife and the two shall become one flesh. Jesus then draws the conclusion that (before God—not considering the practical angle, to which Moses had felt compelled to give recognition in Deut.) divorce is a willful human separation of what God has joined. Jesus here not only shows himself skilled in legal argument and able to escape the trap laid for him, but as an exponent of a higher morality. This section gave the Church his ruling, but it is interesting to note that it had to be modified in Mt. 19:9.

vv. 10–12 Further esoteric instruction was allegedly given to the disciples in response to their bringing up the subject when they were "in the house." (An indication that this was originally localized at Capernaum?) Jesus declares that whoever divorces a wife and marries another commits adultery against her (i.e., the ex-wife). And if the woman divorces her husband and marries another she commits adultery (against her ex-husband). Paul gives the substance of this as command of the Lord in 1 Cor. 7:10–11. He even puts the woman's divorcing of the man first, perhaps because this was a more likely situation, women converts to Christianity finding it difficult to live with heathen husbands. Matthew omits the matter of divorce by women in 19:9, 5:32. Talmudic rules are usually invoked to prove that Paul and Mark have extended the saying of Jesus in this particular, because of conditions in the West. However, the Aramaic marriage contracts of the Jews of Elephantine of the fifth century B.C. contain divorce regulations for both parties; in Brooklyn Museum Papyrus 7, published by the writer in 1953, both partners are Jews. In Jesus' time the older customs may still have prevailed.

10:13–16 Jesus and the Children (Mt. 19:13–15; Lk. 18:15–17). This is a typical story of the brief type. Only the most necessary external information is given. Children were brought to Jesus that he should touch them. Behind this is the belief that a "blessing" would flow forth upon them through contact with the holy man's hand, which had the power even to cure disease (1:31, 41, etc.). The disciples rebuked them (i.e., the parents?) for troubling him. Jesus was "displeased" (only instance of this being said of him) and commanded that they should let the children come to him and should not hinder them. (One may perhaps postulate an earlier version according to which the disciples hindered *children* who came of their own accord.) He adds the significant words "for of such is (i.e., will be) the kingdom of God." ("Of such" seems to extend the remark to include adults who have the characteristics which make children particularly fit for it.) An Amen-saying clarifies the meaning of this utterance: Whoever does not receive the kingdom as a child (receives a gift) will not enter into it. And embracing them he blessed them with laying on of his hands—a concentrated, vivid description. The act of blessing is particularly remarkable. It would almost seem that it is a Passion motif (cf. Gen. 48:9, 14). The only other blessing of persons reported of Jesus is at the parting (Lk. 24:50).

10:17–31 On the Peril of Wealth (Mt. 19:16–30; Lk. 18:18–30). The introductory words refer to Jesus' setting out on a journey. That suits the need of indicating some progression in the travel begun in 10:1, and is narration by Mark. The story that follows was an independent one of the shorter type.

A man came running to Jesus and fell down on his knees (in homage) and asked, "Good teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Rabbinic texts speak of "inheriting the world to come," or "taking possession of the life of the world to come," which illustrate what is meant. Jesus rejected the flattering epithet on the ground that no one is good except one (i.e., God). But "good" in this connection does not mean morally perfect or sinless, but rather "kind." Jesus would not have dreamt, as did a rabbi of less humility, that a voice called out to him, "Good peace to the good teacher from the good Lord, who in his goodness does good to his people."

Jesus then reminded the petitioner of the Commandments, the keeping of which had the promise of life (Deut. 30:15; at Jesus' time taken to mean eternal life). He confined himself to quoting those concerning one's neighbor. The Commandment "do not withhold" (what you owe another; cf. in specialized use, 1 Cor. 7:5) seems to cover the tenth Commandment of the Decalogue and is perhaps interpreting it with an eye to retention of property given as security. Matthew and Luke both omit this difficult item. The fifth Commandment is mentioned last; to have put it ahead of the others would have emphasized it more than was necessary. Furthermore, it gave the man the cue for his answer; for he claimed to have observed all these Commandments from his youth up (beginning, naturally, with the fifth). Jesus, looking upon him, "loved him" (perhaps meaning "caressed him") and gave him the opportunity to become his disciple. There was only one thing he still needed to do: to sell what he had and give it to the poor, thus storing up a treasure in heaven, and to follow Jesus. (The allusion in the A.V. to taking up the cross is not in the best manuscripts and is derived from 8:34.) But the man's countenance darkened at this answer, and he departed sorrowfully, for he had many possessions.

This is an instance where the invitation to discipleship was not accepted. It was not issued with the same intensity as in 1:17, 20 and 2:14, perhaps because Jesus sensed the improbability of acceptance. Mark has put the incident here with an eye to the somber mood set for the Jerusalem journey by 8:34, and in order to lead over to the instruction of vv. 23 ff., for which the reader would not have been prepared at an earlier juncture. He created the impression that Jesus required the giving up of private property by Christians. But what was demanded of this individual as condition of discipleship (cf. v. 21) cannot be generalized in such a manner (cf. Acts 5:4).

Two appendices to this incident follow: vv. 23–27; vv. 28–31.

vv. 23–27 Jesus looks about at the disciples and says: "How hard it is for those having possessions to enter into the kingdom of God!" The disciples allegedly were shocked by these words. Beginning with an endearing "children" (to alleviate their alarm) Jesus then gives the saying in an even more radical form: "How hard it is (for anyone) to enter the kingdom of God!" Then follows the figurative saying (of v. 25) about the camel and the needle's eye, which declares the total impossibility of the rich man's entering the kingdom (a commentary on v. 23).

This saying is evidently based on contemporary Jewish metaphoric speech; cf. the rebuke addressed to an excessively subtle rabbi in the Talmud: "You must be from Pumbeditha (in Babylonia, seat of a school of Jewish learning) where they make an elephant go through a needle's eye." But Jesus gave the familiar verbiage a new twist. The saying bears the stamp of his discernment that to enter the kingdom where God is all-in-all is far more difficult for those with possessions keeping them attached to the world than for the poor. Hence the Beatitude on the latter, Lk. 6:20. However, the reaction of the disciples in v. 26 is not to this saying, but to that of v. 24, a fact casting some doubt on whether the "needle's-eye" saying is in the proper place. They were frightened to a still greater degree and said to themselves, "Who, then, can be saved?" Jesus looked at them and declared that it was impossible for men, but not for God, for whom all things are possible (cf. Gen. 18:14). Perhaps this broadening of the base in vv. 24, 26–27 represents a further development in tradition, in order to take the sharp edge off the words concerning the rich in vv. 23 and 25. A Church establishing itself in the world and regarding the coming of God's kingdom as less immediate than did the Apostles began to welcome the rich and to seek their benefactions. The attitude toward wealth thus had to be softened.

vv. 28–31 Peter now states the case of the disciples: they have done what the rich man of v. 21 did not do; they left everything and followed Jesus. (Have they therefore not deserved to enter the kingdom?) The reply of Jesus is another Amen-saying, giving a promise of a hundredfold recompense, not merely to the disciples but to everyone who forsakes anybody or anything "for his sake and for the sake of the gospel." This seems formulated with an eye to the Church of Mark's day. The rest of v. 30 probably represents additional commentary, answering questions of church members, for with the fading of the belief in Jesus' imminent return there came a feeling that some reward here and now was desirable. Christians will find compensation for what they gave up, in the fellowship of the Church, though amid persecutions, and then in the coming world-age will receive eternal life. (The latter only was probably meant by the allusion to hundredfold recompense in v. 30.) Why Mark added the saying about the first being last (cf. Mt. 20:16, Lk. 13:30) is not clear. It could mean: length of Christian service and reward are not necessarily commensurate. (So Matthew understood it, since he introduces the parable of the laborers in the vineyard here, and closes it with a repetition of this saying.)

10:32–34 The Third Passion Announcement (Mt. 20:17–19; Lk. 18:31–34). Mark has provided the third Passion announcement with an unusually vivid description of situation. They were on the road, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was walking ahead. They (the disciples?) were astounded and those following (the "crowd"?) were full of fear (i.e., awe of Jesus' manner, as in 9:32). Again taking the Twelve aside, Jesus gave them the final Passion announcement (cf. 8:31–33; 9:30–32). It sheds a bit more light on what was to come than did its predecessors. He declares what the narrator has anticipated in v. 32: that they are going up to Jerusalem; that the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes, who will condemn him to death and give him over to the *Gentiles.* (This clarifies what was left vague in 9:31, "into the hands of men.") They will mock him (15:17 ff.), spit at him (14:65, but there attributed to Jews), scourge him (15:15), and kill him. But when killed he will rise again from the dead after three days. Mark, who is writing for Gentiles, does not spare the latter a share in the blame—indeed Gentiles committed the worst acts of violence against Jesus. Nothing is said here of the disciples not understanding Jesus, as in 9:10, 32 (contrast Lk. 18:34). The three Passion announcements show the reader that Jesus was not overtaken unexpectedly by the Passion, but went to Jerusalem prepared for it.

10:35–45 Jesus and the Sons of Zebedee (Mt. 20:20–28; Lk. 22:24–27). This incident is necessarily later than the Messianic confession. It also presupposes the belief in a realistically imagined kingdom and Messianic banquet. The story is concerned with the places of honor at the latter. There was intense jealousy among the Jews in the matter of seating according to rank (cf. Lk. 14:8). When three were together the most important person sat in the middle, the next in rank at his right, the third in rank at the left. The sons of Zebedee sought to steal a march on rival aspirants by asking for both seats of honor. Craftily they tried to get Jesus to commit himself in advance to their request. But he desired to know first what they wished. When they stated it, he said to them [that they do not know what they are asking. Can they drink the cup he drinks and be baptized with the same baptism with which he is (about to be) baptized? (The cup is a symbol of judgment or death, cf. Is. 51:17, 22, and "baptism" or immersion suggests tribulation, cf. Pss. 42:7 and 69:2, or even death, Rom. 6:3. Jesus was thus hinting at his impending Passion.) The two disciples declared their ability to do so, thus justifying his previous remark that they did not know what they were asking. Jesus said to them that they would drink the same cup and be baptized with the same baptism]: the sitting on his right and on his left are not his to give, but (are) for those for whom they have been prepared. It seems quite probable that the bracketed material represents expansion of the story by Mark or a predecessor in the light of events, for it implies that both sons of Zebedee had suffered martyrdom. Only the martyrdom of James, however, is reported (Acts 12:2).

The jealous anger of the other disciples (particularly of Andrew and Peter, whom tradition represented as the first called, 1:16 f.; Jn. 1:40–41) is understandable. Jesus summons the whole group and gives them further instruction. He points to a horrible example: those thinking to rule over the peoples dominate them, and their grandees (i.e., those appointed by these rulers, as were the Roman imperial governors) have power over them. In contrast thereto he lays down his rule: Whoever among them wishes to become great must be their ministering servant (Gr. *diákonos*), and whoever would be first among them must be slave of all (note the intensification), just as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve *and to give his soul* (= life) *as ransom for many*. While this does not extirpate the desire of the ego to excel others, it at least turns it into a channel where it will be useful.

The italicized part of the comparison in 10:45 has been the subject of a great deal of debate. One must note that so far as the point at issue in vv. 42 ff. is concerned, the words of Jesus could have terminated very well with "to serve." The ransom clause is really an unexpected extra (cf. the parallel Lk. 22:27). Whether Mark added it to "plant" an idea that he wishes the reader to have in mind as he approaches the Passion story and especially the incident of the Last Supper (14:24), or whether it is a pre-Marcan addition, matters little. The question is, What does it mean? The word ransom (Gr. *lútron*) is the price paid in lieu of something. Thus the priest Eleasar gave the Roman general Crassus the beam of gold from the Temple as "a ransom for all" (other things), after taking an oath from him that he would be satisfied therewith (Jos., *Ant., 14,* 7, 1).

Jesus pays his life as ransom "for many." Use of the word "many" here is peculiar. It seems probable that it is a scriptural allusion—more specifically to "the many" who are mentioned repeatedly in Is. 53:11–12. This scriptural limitation is cast off in what is probably the oldest echo of this saying outside the Gospels—1 Tim. 2:5–6: "There is one mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as ransom for *all*." This passage suggests that Jesus paid *God* the ransom. But from what were the many ransomed? Does the allusion of Is. 53:12 "he bore the sin of many" provide the answer? Perhaps the primary thought is of ransom from death, as in Ps. 49:8–9, but spiritualized to mean that those whom the Son of man ransoms have eternal life. The word "many," even though a scriptural allusion, hints at the fact that Christ's following will be large, and no doubt Mark's readers are to think of themselves as included (cf. Mt. 8:11). The emphasis is not on the "mass of perdition," but on the multitude of the saved.

10:46–52 The Healing of the Blind Man at Jericho (Mt. 20:29–34; Lk. 18:35–43). Mark leads into this originally independent story by the purely connective statement "and they came to Jericho." We are thus left to suppose that Jesus went to Jerusalem from Peraea.

The story itself is of the brief type, though not fully typical of its class, for it has some vivid touches such as are characteristic of the more elaborate type. As a rule the old stories did not mention the names of persons, and one must suspect that the name of "the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus" was supplied in the course of time, before Mark received it. (A third-century rabbi, Joshua, was a *bar Timai;* the name is a shortened Greek name, perhaps from Timothy.) The localization of the story at Jericho suggests that it came from there. (The *Clementine Recognitions* speak of an early Christian group in that area.)

The incident is described as taking place at the departure from Jericho. The blind beggar is sitting by the wayside. Hearing that it is Jesus the Nazarene (who is passing) he begins to cry out, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me." He gives Jesus the Messianic title "Son of David" as an act of faith, and hopes for help from him. It is the first time the title is used in Mark, and then by a stranger. (That a king and hence also the Messianic one could be expected to heal is shown by the instances of Vespasian's miracle at Alexandria in A.D. 70 which is reported by Tacitus, *4,* 181, and several other historical writers.) "Many" rebuked the man in order to silence him, but he only cried out the more.

Jesus stands still and directs that the blind man be called. Those fetching the latter reassure him with, "Be of good cheer" (cf. 6:50, in evident expectation of a healing miracle), and tell him to arise because Jesus is calling him. The man casts off his mantle, leaps up and approaches Jesus. The latter asks what he wishes. The blind man answers "Rabbouni (cf. on Jn. 20:16), that I may see." Jesus declares, "Go, thy faith has saved thee (i.e., made thee whole, 2:4; 5:34). Immediately he saw, and followed on the way (instead of accepting dismissal). Some would find in this an illustration of the "following Jesus" theme of 10:21. However, it seems merely to be an appropriate ending, evidencing gratitude as well as adherence to the healer, whom the blind man had recognized as Messiah.

Mark may have seen a peculiar fitness for placing this here as the final miracle of Jesus. The blind man's faith is contrasted with the unbelief of the leaders at Jerusalem. His hailing Jesus as Son of David, furthermore, plants the idea necessary for the understanding of 11:9–10, where use of the title is avoided.

B. THE DAYS IN JERUSALEM
11:1–13:37 (Mt. 21–25; Lk. 19:28–21:38)

11:1–10 The Entry into Jerusalem (Mt. 21:1–9; Lk. 19:28–38, cf. Jn. 12:12–19). The opening sentence gives the local background, which naturally was of interest to the old Jerusalem church, but which no one elsewhere could visualize: "When they drew near to Jerusalem (more specifically) to Bethphage *and Bethany* at the Mount of Olives." Some manuscripts of Mark have only Bethany, which Origen considered the correct reading. Matthew has Bethphage, which raises the question whether that was what he read in his copy of Mark, but Luke has both names. It seems likely that rival claims of the second-century villages were reconciled in the present combination reading. Bethany may owe its mention to its prominence in the Gospel according to John. Bethphage, however, suits the description *at* (the foot of) the Mount of Olives better, and was probably the one meant by Mark.

vv. 1b–6 The account of the entry is preceded by one dealing with the preparation for it: the finding of the animal that was so essential. Jesus sends two disciples, whose names are not given, ahead to the village in question. He speaks with supernatural knowledge, telling them what the events will be. This, coupled with the exact fulfillment, lends to this story the atmosphere of sacred legend. The words they are to speak to the owner of the animal, "The Lord has need of it," are suited to the cultic atmosphere; nowhere else in Mark does Jesus designate himself "Lord."

The two disciples find a colt tied at the gate of a house by the side of the road. It is one that nobody has ever ridden on—providentially held in readiness and particularly suitable to bear the prospective Messiah as its first rider. Mark makes no allusion to the prophecy of Zech. 9:9, and so the question has been raised whether he really conceived of the beast as the colt of an ass. The word he uses is the same as English "foal" (Gr. *pṓlos*), which in Hellenistic Greek can mean the young of various animals, but when not otherwise specified means "young horse" or even "horse." Did the oldest tradition think of Jesus as riding to the city on a horse? But what meaning would there be in Jesus' riding to the city for the last mile except to fulfill Zech. 9:9? Indeed, such a conservative scholar as Dalman could raise the question whether the story of the entry is not the product of inference from that passage. Mark's omission of reference to the prediction is quite in line with his infrequent use of direct Scripture quotation. It may well be that in early Christian gatherings the scriptural prophecy formed the reading lesson and that the story was then related to show how the prophecy was fulfilled. Certainly any readers of the Gospel who were familiar with the Greek Bible translation must have thought at once of Zechariah's prophecy. It stated that Zion's king would come, righteous and saving (Gr. *sṓzōn*), riding on an ass (literally "yoke animal," invariably an ass in Hellenistic Greek), and (i.e., more precisely) on a new (i.e., unused) colt." (The conjunction "and" in the underlying Semitic had explanatory force. This was understood by whoever first formulated Mark's story, but was not clear to Matthew; cf. Mt. 21:7.) The thought of riding down the Mount of Olives did not, however, grow out of the Zechariah passage. It was dictated by the actual or supposed arrival of Jesus via the Jericho route.

The two disciples brought the colt, placed their outer garments on it (cf. 2 Kings 9:13) and set Jesus upon it. (The unbroken beast does not resist, but serves willingly.)

As Jesus rides toward the city the accompanying crowd splits up—one part precedes and the other part follows. Of those that precede, some spread their garments on the way and others strew bunches of foliage, cutting it from the fields. Both those preceding and those following cry out the words of Ps. 118:25 f., but with a new meaning. The first word is quoted in Aramaic, suggesting that Mark's story is translated; in such a source the rest of the quotation, too, must have been given in that language rather than in Hebrew. "*Hosanna*" (Heb. *Hōshī'ā-nnā*) really meant "give deliverance:" (cf. 2 Sam. 14:4; 2 Ki. 6:26, addressed to the king; Ps. 20:10; 118:25, addressed to God), but here is used as an exclamation of praise. It evidently became that rather than an appeal for help because the psalm was used in the Temple at the joyous occasion of the feast of the Tabernacles. In the continuation, "blessed (praised) be he that cometh" is construed as allusion to the Messiah, with the further phrase "in the name of the Lord" taken as explanatory of "coming." This psalm exegesis is supplemented by the cry, "Blessed be the coming kingdom of our father David" (cf. Acts 2:29), a remark clarifying further what is involved here. The concluding "*Osanná* in the highest" suggests that "*Osanná*" is used as equivalent to the "glory" of Lk. 2:14 (cf. 19:38). The adulation is to ring out in the high heavens as well as here!

The story ends at this point. The reader who believes that the episode reported has a substratum of fact would like to know: Did Jesus enter the city as such? Could he enter it through an eastern gate near the northeast corner, or did he go around to the North gate? What was the public reaction to the demonstration? Did the Roman garrison, ever watchful for tumults, pay any attention? Such questions are not answered. This is sacred legend, with the light focused on the holy personage in which the worshiping congregation is alone interested. There is good reason to believe that 11:1–10 was originally introductory to the story of the Passion. The entry into Jerusalem was re-enacted in a Palm Sunday procession in Byzantine times. The story reads as though it were formulated in the Primitive Church for such a purpose.

11:11 Jesus in the Temple (Mt. 21:10–17; Lk. 19:45–48). Mark apparently felt that the story required a continuation. The next materials he had available were the fig-tree incident (11:12–14, 20–22) and the story of the cleansing of the Temple (11:15–19). It was necessary to lead into them. The first story began with a coming of Jesus to the city from Bethany. It was thus necessary to have him go out to Bethany after the arrival at the city. But what could he have Jesus do at the first arrival? His solution was to have him visit the Temple: This had the advantage of preparing the way for 11:15 ff. Mark merely states that he looked about at everything (hence saw the abuses that existed there), though spontaneous, immediate action, as in Jn. 2:13 f. would be more natural. Perhaps Mal. 3:1, predicting the coming of the Lord (Gr. *kyrios,* hence easily taken to mean Christ) to his Temple, helped to produce this transitional verse. Mark, furthermore, is attempting to set up a chronology of a Passion week and hence has to account for six days. The first is marked off by having Jesus go to Bethany for the night.

That Mark's material here represents a reconstruction of events is shown by the fact that both Matthew and Luke disregard the preliminary visit to the Temple, and immediately relate the story of its cleansing. One might think that in any visit to the Temple, Jesus would have attended the afternoon sacrifice (cf. on Lk. 1:10). But such consigning of Jesus to a passive role possessed no story interest. For Gentile Christians of Mark's day the Temple at Jerusalem and its cult belonged to the sphere of sacred antiquities.

11:12–14 The Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mt. 21:18–20). On leaving Bethany the following morning Jesus felt hungry (rather strange if he had enjoyed hospitality, but necessary for the story) and approached a fig tree that already displayed foliage. This was a sign that it was a healthy tree and hence bore fruit regularly. Mark observes that it was not yet the time of figs (it being April, and figs being ripe in June). But this remark seems misleading. Given a late Passover and favorable weather, it was possible for green, bitter figs (Arab. *ajr*) to have developed on a tree in a warm location, such as the southeast slope of the Mount of Olives. Palestinians will eat them, much as we might eat a green wild apple in summer. Jesus may have approached the tree in the expectation of finding some such figs. He pronounced an imprecation on the tree for disappointing him—"Forever may no one anymore eat fruit from thee!" If Mark notes that the disciples heard what Jesus said to the fig tree he is merely preparing the way for the sequel in v. 20. The episode of the cleansing of the Temple has thus been sandwiched into the fig-tree story as that of the woman with the issue of blood, 5:25–34, was injected into the story of the daughter of Jairus.

This story is unique in the Gospels. It does not belong to either of the two main types of narrative we have constantly encountered. Luke evidently did not consider it very valuable, for he omitted it. It makes sense only if the act described is symbolic—in other words, if the fig tree stands for Jerusalem or for the Jewish people. Even then it is a relapse into Old Testament mentality, where the "blessing" and the "curse" are considered magically potent in bringing about a desired result. Prophets undertook symbolic actions to make vivid the content of their prophecy. It is conceivable that Jesus, under the influence of the failure of his teaching at Jerusalem, would have performed such a prophetic-symbolic act. But the disciples are the only witnesses of it, and so it would seem superfluous; the prophecy of doom is amply taken care of in ch. 13. Some think that an original parable of Jesus, much like that of the unfruitful fig tree of Lk. 13:6–9, has here been historified. Whatever the origin of the story, its chief significance for Mark probably lies in having something to relate for each day of the Passion week. While he does not need this part of it here, since he has the cleansing of the Temple for this day, he needs its sequel, 11:20–26, for the third day, and so has to prepare the way for it.

11:15–19 The Cleansing of the Temple (Mt. 21:12–13; Lk. 19:45–48; Jn. 2:13–17). This is a story of the simple type. That it was floating material is shown by the fact that John's Gospel can put another version of it at the occasion of an earlier Jerusalem pilgrimage. It begins very simply: "And they came to Jerusalem." (The absence of an "again" as in v. 27 is puzzling: it sounds like a first arrival.) Going into the Temple, Jesus began to drive out those who were selling and buying; he overthrew the tables of the money-changers (who no doubt converted foreign moneys, especially for payment of the annual Temple tax; cf. Mt. 17:24) and of the sellers of doves (Lk. 2:24); and he did not permit anyone to carry a vessel through the Temple (i.e., take a short cut through the sacred precincts for private purposes—a thing also forbidden in the Talmud). He taught them (i.e., the crowd of v. 18b) thus: he quoted Is. 56:7 to show what God intended the Temple to be—a universally acclaimed house of prayer—and Jer. 7:11 to show what they were making of it. That no resistance was offered highlights the tremendous impression made by Jesus. He acts with Messianic authority. It seems likely from the angle of form criticism that the originally independent unit ended with the Saying of Jesus in v. 17, which was held to be of general significance. A pragmatic conclusion is, however, added by the evangelist, as in 3:6, linking the event with the Passion. The high priests and scribes, hearing of the incident, now plotted to kill Jesus because of their fear of him, for the whole crowd was beside itself at his teaching (1:22).

It is a question whether Mark has not detached the story from an original continuation in 11:27–33. The beginning of the latter passage certainly invites the assumption that it is the reaction to the cleansing of the Temple. But cf. on that passage. If v. 19 mentions Jesus' departure at eventide, this is merely the connecting link fashioned by Mark to work in the next morning's return.

11:20–26 The Conversation about the Withered Fig Tree (Mt. 21:20–22)

vv. 20:22 Having taken Jesus out of town in v. 19, Mark has to bring him back again the next morning (the third day of the Passion week), and hence can introduce a sequel to the cursing of the fig tree. Peter calls attention to the fact that the tree had withered overnight. The response of Jesus is, "Have faith in God" (the thought being that the miracle was a demonstration of Jesus' own faith). Such an immediate withering of the tree, however, was in no wise required by the words of Jesus in 11:14. Tradition or Mark himself may have assumed that the fig tree must have withered on being cursed by Jesus. Introduction of this material had several advantages for Mark. It helped prepare the way for ch. 13 by showing the awesome power of Jesus' words, and it was an excellent means of leading over to vv. 23–25. The withered fig tree—so one scholar has aptly observed—is used by Mark to hang sayings of Jesus on it.

v. 23 The first saying, about faith moving mountains, is an Amen-saying which appears in a different connection in Mt. 17:20 (cf. also Lk. 17:6). It is a hyperbolic illustration of the dictum: "All things are possible to him that believes" (9:23). The idea of uprooting mountains is found also in rabbinic texts, but is not applied in this same way. Paul, however, so applies it in 1 Cor. 13:2. (Did he know this to be a saying of Jesus?) But faith, Jesus teaches, is vitiated by the negative doubt of the heart (= the mind).

vv. 24–25 As though out of fear that this idea of faith moving mountains could be misunderstood, Mark adds a saying linking prayer with faith. It represents an expansion of the saying found in Mt. 7:7: If one believes that he has already received what he prays for (attitude of complete certainty) he will receive it. The next saying is put here apparently by association with the key word "prayer" (cf. Mt. 6:14–15): Jesus warns that only the forgiving heart can pray in the hope of receiving forgiveness (or anything else) from the Father in heaven—the nucleus of the petition in the Lord's prayer (Lk. 11:1 ff.).

v. 26 This saying is missing in important manuscripts, and probably was added on the basis of Mt. 6:15.

11:27–33 The Question about Authority (Mt. 21:23–27; Lk. 20:1–8). This is another story of the simple type. The interest is wholly concentrated on what Jesus said, but a few items of information as to the place and the interrogators is given. He is walking about (teaching?) in the Temple —presumably in the halls of the outer court—when the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders come to him. (This sounds like the whole Synedrium, but that seems improbable at this juncture.) They ask Jesus by what authority he does these things and who gave him this authority that he does these things. The second question sharpens the first. The authority can only be from God or be self-constituted. The purpose of the questions is to induce Jesus to say something that can be used to destroy him (cf. v. 18). The allusion to "these things" is obscure. He is not described as doing anything but walking about.

Jesus makes an answer conditional on their replying to a counterquestion (cf. 10:3), viz., was the baptism by John from heaven or from men? With a storyteller's omniscient viewpoint Mark now relates how they must have reasoned. To answer "from God" was to expose themselves to the question, Why then they did not believe him? To answer "from men" was a thing they feared to do because of the people, all of whom believed John to have been truly a prophet. They therefore say that they do not know. Jesus in turn declines to answer their question, and thus foils their purpose.

If this actually took place in the Temple, the plan may have been to bring Jesus as a "dissenting teacher" before the court of twenty-three members who, according to the Talmud, sat at the entrance to the "Mount of the Temple" (the east gate of the Court of Women?), and then before two further courts, the last being the Synedrium. However, the allusions to the obscure "these things" in v. 28 are crucial for the evaluation of this material. One is tempted to link them with the cleansing of the Temple, as previously noted. But the old brief stories were self-contained and did not refer to others. A similar unexplained "these things" is found in Mt. 11:25 (from Q). It is possible that Mark merely found the dialogue in his source, with some such introduction as "the Pharisees said to Jesus" and that he provided the introductory situation-description of v. 27, lending the occasion additional importance by adding the high priests and the elders. If that were the case, "these things" could have referred to things done by Jesus in Galilee, and the placement here would be purely editorial.

An incident that allegedly took place in the Temple is reported in the fragment of an uncanonical Gospel from Oxyrhynchus (see p. 23). It describes Jesus as taking his disciples into the sacred area and walking about with them. A Pharisaic priest asks the Savior how he can walk about and look at the holy vessels without having bathed? Jesus asks him whether *he* is clean, whereupon the priest asserts that he is, for he has bathed in the Pool of David, descending by one staircase and ascending by the other, and has changed his garments before coming to view the sacred vessels. Jesus thereupon assails him, saying, "Woe to you blind that do not see" (cf. Mt. 23:16 ff.), and ridicules his purifying himself in such water. He and his disciples have immersed themselves in living water from above (cf. Jn. 4:14).

12:1–12 Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mt. 21:33–46; Lk. 20:9–19). Mark thinks of this parable as addressed to the delegation of 11:27 f. The introductory words, however, suggest that in a previous compilation it was an illustration of Jesus' teaching (like the parable of the sower in ch. 4). The institution of farming by tenants, well known in sections of the Palestine of Jesus and the Primitive Church, provides the background. The parable tells of a vineyard that was let out by its absentee owner to tenants. That this is allegorical is easily discerned. The vineyard is Israel, as in Isaiah's ancient song (Is. 5:1). Its absentee owner is God. The tenant farmers to whom it is let out (on long-term lease) are the leaders of the

Jewish people. The servants sent to collect rent at the time of the fruit-bearing are the prophets. The allegory is a bit inadequate in that the prophets were not sent in quick succession as here presupposed, or even annually, but over a long period of time. That they had been badly treated was a belief of Jesus' day, and legend reported the fates of some of them (Mt. 23:31, 37; Lk. 13:33). For story-telling purposes a series of two preliminary messengers was enough, but the author evidently felt that this was insufficient to do justice to history, and so added the statement about many others being sent (v. 5b). The landlord still has an only and beloved son left. Him he sends last, feeling sure that the son will be respected. But the tenant farmers see in him the heir whose death would put them in a position to seize the vineyard. (There were situations in which such a thing was legally possible.) So they slay him and cast his body out of the vineyard. This is certainly allegorical of the ministry and fate of Jesus, and hence can hardly have been spoken by him. The allusion to the son's body being cast out of the vineyard *after* he was killed is a peculiar one. Both Matthew and Luke change it—evidently it had been altered in their texts of Mark. Jesus now asks: "What will the owner do?" And he answers his own question by saying: "He will come and kill the tenant farmers and lease the vineyard to new tenants." Here the underlying thought is the destruction of the Jewist state and the passing of the kingdom to Christianized Gentiles.

One might think that at this point the parable had reached its natural conclusion. But from the angle of the Church it lacked something: mention of the resurrection of the beloved son. It was with this in mind that a final question of Jesus is added: whether the hearers have not read Ps. 118:22–23. The stone the builders rejected (= the son cast out of the vineyard) has—through his resurrection—become the "head of the corner," i.e., probably the keystone of the porch of the Temple, rather than "cornerstone" as traditionally understood. While this departs from the allegory of the vineyard, it effectively supplies the essential thought of the important function of the resurrected son.

In closing, Mark adds a statement to keep the narrative going: the Jewish leaders, perceiving that the parable was directed against them, wanted to arrest Jesus, but feared to do so and departed.

12:13–17 The Question of the Pharisees (Mt. 22:15–22; Lk. 20:20–26). The hostile purpose of 11:18 and 12:12 carries further. This is shown by a story of the brief type adduced by Mark. Certain of the Pharisees and Herodians (who appear unexpectedly here; cf. 3:6) were sent to catch Jesus in some statement (no doubt one of a political nature, hence the presence of the latter group). They simulated sincerity. Addressing Jesus as teacher, they first laud him by declaring that he is true (i.e., an upright, reliable man) and does not consider anybody (i.e., care whether his words please or displease), for he does not look at the faces of men (watching for their reaction), but teaches "the way of God" (religion; cf. Acts 18:25) according to the truth (cf. 12:32). This "neutral" estimate of Jesus is interesting; the one in Lk. 24:19 goes even further. They then ask whether it is in accord with the law of Moses to pay the poll tax to the Romans. (If Jesus affirmed it, he could be no Messiah, for it was based on a census, and a census was contrary to the will of God; cf. 2 Sam. 24. If he denied it, he was a zealot revolutionary. Since Judaea was not a senatorial province, but an imperial one, directly under management by the emperor's appointees, the poll tax could well be conceived of as a tax paid directly to the ruler.)

Recognizing their hypocritical intent Jesus asks the counterquestion, Why are they tempting him? and then requests that a denarius be brought to him. When one is handed him he asks whose portrait and inscription it bears. They reply "Caesar's." "Caesar" was the cognomen of the men of the Julian family, which died out with Caligula. It generally stood at the head of the cognomina of the rulers. The emperor at this time was Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of the deified Augustus. Thus an actual denarius of Tiberius bears the inscription *Ti Caesar divi Aug f Augustus*. That one spoke of "Caesar" without use of the *praenomen* is also indicated by the inscription of "the decree of Caesar" from Nazareth (see p. 189). Jesus then gives the famous reply, which recognizes the silver coinage minted by the emperor as his property and therefore returnable to him on demand, but places the emphasis on rendering to God that which is his (clearly not thinking of money, but rather of the moral and religious obligations). The answer astounds the interrogators.

Since Jesus' message was that of the imminence of the kingdom of God, this was not "ethical teaching." He had no interest in the problems belonging to an order that would soon pass away. It was natural, however, that a Church adjusting itself to a continuing existence in the world, should try to draw inferences from this saying about the relation of Christianity to the state. The incident was related in the fragments of an unknown Gospel with interesting changes (*Egerton Pap.*, 2). Jesus, after being praised, is asked, "Tell us, is it lawful to pay to kings those things which pertain to the government? Shall we or shall we not?" The question is thus broadened in comparison with Mark. The reply of Jesus is only partially preserved. In the apocryphal Gospel according to Thomas the following version appears:

> (100) They showed Jesus a gold (coin) and said to him: Caesar's men ask taxes from us. He said: Give the things of Caesar to Caesar, give the things of God to God and give me what is mine.

The concluding part of the saying can more easily be understood as a Christian addition than as original. The gold coin is not as original as the denarius, and the allusion to taxes shows the desire to broaden the bearing of the saying.

12:18–27 The Question of the Sadducees (Mt. 22:23–33; Lk. 20:27–40). Mark has not heretofore mentioned the Sadducees. As they represented the priestly aristocracy, they belong very much in the picture of the time of Jesus. Mark now introduces a story of the simple type about a clash of Jesus with them. It would be difficult to understand if we did not know that the Sadducees denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and so Mark supplies this information (cf. also Acts 23:8). They tell Jesus about an obviously invented case of a woman who was wed to seven brothers in succession (under the levirate law of Deut. 25:5), and ask: "Whose wife will she be in (the state of) the resurrection of the dead?" (Therewith they seek to ridicule the teaching of the afterlife.) Jesus asks them whether they are not rather proving (with their false conclusions) that they themselves are mistaken, and know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God. (As to the latter, their idea of the resurrection is inadequate.) Those risen from the dead will not marry or be given in marriage, but will be like the angels. As to the dead, namely that they are to be raised (according to the Scriptures), he asks them whether they have not read in the book of Moses (the Pentateuch, the most authoritative part of Scripture), in the "thornbush (section)" that God says, "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Ex. 3:6). He adds the pointed saying (based on the use of the present tense in the Exodus quotation): "God is not a God of the dead but of the living." He closes by declaring that they are greatly mistaken (in their position). This is argumentation of the kind used by the Pharisaic scribes. It has a close parallel in rabbinic sources, which relate that Gamaliel II (*c.* A.D. 90) offered the Sadducees a proof of the resurrection from Deut. 11:9, where God promised to give Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob the land. (The point is: If this is to be fulfilled, they must rise again from the dead.) The quotation allegedly adduced by Jesus is not as relevant as Gamaliel's for proving the *resurrection,* though it is suitable under that kind of biblical interpretation to prove the *immortality* of the patriarchs (cf. Lk. 16:24; 23:43).

12:28–34 The Question about the Greatest Commandment (Mt. 22:34–40; Lk. 10:25–28).

vv. 28–31 Mark establishes a connection between this material and the preceding by saying that a (Pharisaic) scribe had overheard them disputing, and seeing that Jesus had answered well, approached him with the question as to what is the most important commandment. Later Jewish law considered all 248 commandments and 365 prohibitions of the Pentateuch as equally important, but this can hardly have been the case in Jesus' time (cf. Mt. 5:19; 23:23). Without the usual counterquestion, Jesus quotes Deut. 6:4–5 as the greatest commandment and Lev. 19:18 as second in rank, adding that there is none greater than these. The first passage was part of the *Shema*, the Jewish confession of faith (Deut. 6:4–9; 11:13–21; Num. 15:37–41), which every adult male was required to recite morning and night. An additional phrase ("with all thy mind") not found in the LXX is supplied, and a different word is used for "strength" (perhaps because the LXX word *"dynamis"* has a more particular use in this Gospel). The phylacteries (Mt. 23:5) from Qumran show that the scripture passages in use at the time of Christ probably were Deut. 5:1–6:9; 10:12–11:21; Ex. 13:1–10.

vv. 32–34a This meets with the approval of the scribe, who repeats some of the phrases with minor variations. (Thus to the "one God" he adds from Deut. 4:35 "and there is no other but he." In speaking of loving God he omits "with all the soul," and for "with all the mind" substitutes "with all the understanding.") He then declares that this is "more than burnt offerings and (other) sacrifices" (cf. 1 Sam. 15:22). Jesus, seeing that he had spoken wisely, tells him that he is not far from the kingdom of God (that concept not used in its full eschatological meaning, but as equivalent to being a follower of Jesus).

Mark may have built this up out of a saying of Jesus about the greatest commandment. That the saying is the primary thing appears from the fact that both Matthew and Luke do not have the further dialogue of vv. 32–34. They either did not read that element in the text of Mark as they had it before them or they omitted it—perhaps because they recognized that it was not old tradition. Luke, furthermore, removes the story from its situation in Mark to a different one and gives it the other way round—the lawyer answering his own question and Jesus approving.

v. 34b Mark provides a conclusion to show that Jesus was the victor in all these debates. After that no one dared ask him any question. (He could not be trapped, and worsted his opponents so thoroughly that they gave up trying.)

12:35–37 The Son of David (Mt. 22:41–46; Lk. 20:41–44). Jesus shows the insufficiency of the Messianic doctrine of the scribes. Mark again has in all probability fashioned a narrative incident from what was received as a saying. He has provided a few words of situation-description suggesting that this was spoken to a crowd in the Temple. But both Matthew and Luke disregard this setting. The question, "How (is it that) the scribes say that the Christ is a son of David?" reminds the reader of the one asked Jesus in 9:11: "The scribes say (do they not) that Elias must first come?" Since Jesus there corrected that idea, one must likewise expect a correction here. He declares that David who, according to the title of Ps. 110 spoke in the Holy Spirit (i.e., in the state of inspiration), referred to the Messiah as "my Lord." How then can he be his son? ("Son of David" is a term indicating inferiority to David; the ancestor is more than the descendant.) This was evidently the end of the received saying. Mark rounds off the piece by the remark of v. 37b that the big crowd heard him gladly. (Luke omits this; Matthew provides a different conclusion.)

It would certainly seem that Jesus here brushes aside the title "Son of David" and therewith the dynastic and nationalistic idea of the Messiah. His contemporaries, the people of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect, expected a Messiah of Israel, as military leader and universal king, and invoked Old Testament texts to prove that he would be a scion of David. While "Son of David" does not seem to have been commonly used among them, it is vindicated as a Messianic title in the pre-Christian Psalms of Solomon 17:21 and in rabbinic texts. But Jesus (or the Church?) held that the Messiah was more than one who would restore the kingdom of Israel. Identification of the Messiah with the heavenly Son of man of Dan. 7:13 required putting him on a higher level, and this apparently is the title toward which the saying of vv. 35–37 is steering.

If the saying is authentic and not a product of the Church's theological reflection, did Jesus therewith deny the necessity of the Messiah's being of Davidic stock? If so, was it because he could not qualify? That this title was given to him on occasion (cf. 10:47)—granting the reliability of the reports—need be no more than Messianic dogma. One could apply it to the individual whom one regarded as the Messiah. It certainly cannot, in the instances where it is used, rest on knowledge of his antecedents. It is extremely doubtful whether actual descendants of David existed in those times. The Old Testament prophecies were a death warrant for any known member of that house. Persian and Hellenistic rulers, Maccabees and Herodians, all had a vital interest in seeing to it that there were none left. (For Herod this is vividly reflected in Mt. 2:13–18.) If the Romans are said to have ferreted out and executed such persons this is unreliable (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 12, 19, 33); it is merely based on rounding up the kindred of Jesus. For in the Church it was a dogma that Christ was "descended from David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3; cf. 2 Tim. 2:8). Genealogies were soon to be constructed to prove such descent (Mt. 1:1–16; Lk. 3:23–38), but they already disagree about the grandfather's identity and are genealogically worthless. Jesus, we may well believe on the basis of this saying, did not consider Davidic blood of primary importance for the Messiah. If John the Baptist could say that God could raise up children to Abraham from these stones (Lk. 3:8), it was equally possible to say that he could raise a son to David by means other than from his "seed." Matthew's and Luke's Nativity stories reduce Davidic descent to a mere formality.

12:38–40 Discourse against Pharisaism (Mt. 23:1–36; Lk. 20:45–47). The closing part of v. 37 has a transitional function. It brings to mind that Jesus was addressing the people (v. 35) and enables Mark to add a brief discourse. It is introduced with the words "and in his teaching he said." This suggests that Mark is giving only an excerpt from more copious materials. The criticism of the Messianic dogma of the scribes is broadened here to a criticism of their pretensions and actions. Jesus tells the people to beware of them (cf. 8:15). They are bent: (1) on exalting themselves, as illustrated by their robes (Gr. *stolḗ,* Heb. *tallīth,* worn long and with fringes), salutations, presiding in synagogues and receiving places of honor at meals; (2) on devouring the property of widows (cf. Ex. 22:22)—a thing that may have been more common than rabbinic sources indicate. An instance, though localized in Rome and with the scribes being impostors, is related in Jos., *Ant., 18,* 3, 5); (3) they pray long prayers in pretense (of devotion). The *Shemoneh Esreh* composed of eighteen paragraphs called "blessings" or "praises," the basic Pharisaic prayer, was apparently already in use in this time, though perhaps not in its fully developed form. Jesus prophesies that their punishment (in the Last Judgment) will be the sterner (because they should know better). This reckoning with the Pharisaic scribes seems appropriate since they or the Pharisees appear in the Gospel as the leading opponents of Jesus. Matthew has expanded this section into a major discourse.

12:41–44 The Widow's Mite (Lk. 21:1–4). Mark ends the public ministry of Jesus with this little incident. What led him to put it here? The fact that Jesus was teaching in the Temple in vv. 35, 38 and the mention of widows in v. 40 could easily bring this story to his mind. The passage also places the humble and sacrificial piety of the common people into sharp contrast with the mercenary attitude of the scribes mentioned in v. 40.

Allegedly Jesus sat opposite the "treasury" (cf. Jn. 8:20), observing how the crowd cast "copper" (= money) into "the treasury." (Josephus refers to numerous treasuries existing at the Temple, but also calls one *"the* treasury," *Ant., 19,* 6, 1. Rabbinic sources indicate that there were thirteen trumpet-shaped receptacles for different kinds of offerings and that they were set up in a hall or colonnade of the Court of the Women. The part of the hall where these stood is presumably meant here.) Many rich men, the story relates, brought much. A poor widow came and brought two small coins (Gr. *leptá,* which Mark explains for readers living where Roman coinage was used, as amounting to a *kodrántēs = quadrans;* R.S.V.: penny). Calling his disciples, Jesus declares that the widow brought more than all the rest of the people, who merely gave out of their abundance, while out of her poverty she brought all she had, her whole life (Gr. *bíos,* in the sense of livelihood, as in Prov. 31:3, LXX). This is one of the most memorable of Jesus' sayings, and the widow provides a touching example of women's devotion to religious causes.

One may, however, doubt that this was an actual incident of Jesus' ministry. How could Jesus see the coins? How could he know the woman was a poor widow, and that this was her whole livelihood? There is also the matter of sitting in the Temple. This is contrary to Pharisaic regulations, though one cannot prove that the rules in question had been developed in the time of Christ. But a more important reason for not regarding this as an actual incident is given by the occurrence of a very similar story in a Buddhistic work written some time between 100 B.C.–A.D. 300. A traveling folktale may be the common parent of both stories. It seems likely that Jesus related this as a parable—some of his other parables, too, have links with folktales—and that Mark or tradition before him converted it into a biographical incident. This required only a few small touches.

13:1–4 Prediction of the Destruction of the Temple (Mt. 24:1–3; Lk. 21:5–7). This section is introductory to the Apocalypse of 13:5 ff. It is composed of two originally unconnected pieces vv. 1–2 and vv. 3–4. The important element in the first is the saying attributed to Jesus in v. 2. Mark provides a narrative transition to it, by relating the departure from the Temple (and therewith at last terminating the third day of the Passion week). The saying of Jesus was evidently given in the second-person singular. To conform with this, Mark has an unnamed disciple make a remark: "Teacher, see what stones, what buildings!" There is remembrance here of the great Herodian masonry, some of which is still to be seen (e.g., the Wailing Wall of the Jews), and of the buildings of which Jos., *Ant., 15,* 11 has given a description. Jesus says: "Dost thou see these great buildings? There will not be left here one stone upon a stone which will not be thrown down." His words in part overlap those of the disciple—an indication of the artificiality of the connection. The saying attributed to Jesus does not agree with his attitude toward the Temple in 11:15 ff. or with the view of the Primitive Church throughout Acts. Paul, furthermore, shows no knowledge of this saying in 2 Thess. 2:1–12, where one might expect to find it mentioned. It may thus be a prophecy that was formulated in the sixties, after the death of James the Just (Eus. *Eccl. Hist., 2,* 23). Perhaps it was no longer safe for Christians to enter the Temple.

vv. 3–4 Mark has a fondness for describing Jesus as giving esoteric teaching to the disciples or to an inner circle. It usually consists of commentary to a preceding saying. However, no transition is made here from the situation of v. 1 to that of v. 3. The latter verse gives a new situation-description. Jesus now is sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the Temple, and four disciples—Peter, James, John and Andrew—privately ask him a question. (The source from which this was derived included Andrew in the inner circle, which hitherto was not the case, cf. 5:37 and 9:2, and lists the names in the same order as in 3:16 ff.) In the light of the present context it is difficult to see how the four can speak *privately* with Jesus, for one must assume that he is on the way to Bethany for the night, attended by the Twelve. This situation-description, therefore, was not formulated originally to stand in continuity with vv. 1–2. That is confirmed also by the question asked by the four: "When will these things be and what is the sign when all these things are to be completed?" (The latter point presupposes a belief that great happenings are foreshadowed by advance portents.) This does not take up the prediction of the razing of the Temple in v. 2, but implies that some statement of a broader apocalyptic nature has preceded.

The Synoptic Apocalypse

13:5–37 (Mt. 24:4–36; Lk. 21:8–36)

"Apocalyptic" literature is literature in which the attempt is made to unveil the future. Its roots lay in Gentile literature, but it flourished particularly among the pious Jews, who avidly read its prophecies of the downfall of the wicked and the triumph of the godly through divine intervention of some kind. The progenitor of this literature in the Jewish quarter was the apocalyptic prophecy put into the mouth of Daniel at the time of the oppression under the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes, *c.* 165 B.C. Since harassment of the godly was a situation that repeated itself, ever-new apocalypses sprang up and other ancient worthies became the revelatory instruments. Christians, too, took over the idea of producing apocalyptic prophecy, making extensive use of Jewish apocalypses. The Revelation of John is a work of this kind and there was an apocryphal one ascribed to Peter which was even included in the New Testament in some quarters in the second century. But apocalyptic prophecy was also attributed to the historical Jesus, as shown by this Synoptic Apocalypse. It should not be overlooked, however, that in this piece some of the trappings of the apocalypses are missing. In these a visionary is usually addressed by an angel and tells in the first person what he heard or saw in the celestial realm or about the future. Here we have instead an apocalyptic address. Whether it is a Jewish prophecy that has been adapted to Christian purpose with some additions, or a compilation of diverse sayings like all other discourses of Jesus, is the question. We must bear in mind that the Primitive Church had prophets, and that some of these prophesied what they believed they had received through inspiration directly from the heavenly Christ. Revisionist or amplifying repetition of words Jesus had spoken is also a possibility. There are too many allusions hinting of things happening after the time of Jesus to attribute the whole to him.

13:5–8 Signs of the Second Coming (Mt. 24:4–8; Lk. 21:8–11). The introductory "he *began* to say to them" (cf. the similar phrase in 6:34; 8:31) suggests that this is only a selection made from much fuller material. The exhortation "see to it" corresponds to the "dost thou see?" of v. 2. The Apocalypse thus begins with a warning against being led astray by the many who will come [in his name] saying, "I am he" (cf. Jn. 8:24, 28). If the phrase "in my name" were an addition the saying would simply be an anticipation of v. 21; but it already stood in the manuscripts of Mark used by Matthew and Luke. There were, indeed, pseudo Messiahs in the period of the Jewish revolt, but can we suppose that such sought to infiltrate the Palestinian church, claiming to be Jesus returned to earth? Such an allusion shows us how little has been preserved in Acts about the Primitive Church. Paul's "false brethren" (Gal. 2:4) come closest to this.

vv. 7–8 They are not to be frightened by wars and rumors of wars. These "must" come about, but do not yet mean that the "end" has come. There will be real international turmoil, nation rising against nation and kingdom against kingdom.

It seems clear that in speaking of wars and rumors of wars we are in Mark's contemporary situation. Can it be identified? In the period between the summer of A.D. 68 and the end of 69 the Roman empire was in peril through strife over the succession to Nero. Vespasian, who was about to begin the siege of Jerusalem, desisted, to await authorization by the new emperor. Galba was overthrown in the spring of 69. There were major troop movements, when the army of the Rhine elevated Vitellius. In June of 69, under instruction by Vitellius, Vespasian renewed his activity in Palestine and occupied Hebron, only to desist when he was proclaimed emperor by the army of the East and had to take his forces to Rome to defeat Vitellius. It was not until after he had established himself at the end of 69 that he could prosecute the Jewish war, and that task he assigned to his son Titus, who began operations in the spring of A.D. 70. In the situation of 69 many Jews may have believed that they were going to see the empire fall apart into warring kingdoms. Christians may have thought that "the end" was at hand, but the apocalyptist warns that things will get worse.

Jesus also predicts earthquakes here and there, and famines. These are stock elements of the eschatological woes, but events of recent memory helped to impress their potential on the mind. There were the terrible earthquakes at Antioch in 37, in Phrygia in 61, and the destruction of Pompeii in 63. There was the world-wide famine under Claudius in 48–49 (cf. Acts 11:29–30). The apocalyptist is evidently thinking of all these, for he goes on to say that these (things) are only the beginning of the sufferings (really "birth pangs," preceding the birth of the Messianic Age, cf. 1 Thess. 5:3; it is a fixed concept in rabbinic texts).

13:9–13 Admonitions for the Beginning of the Sufferings (Mt. 24:19–14; Lk. 21:12–19)

v. 9 Mark makes a fresh start here with: "See (to) yourselves." Christians will be handed over to courts, scourged in the synedria and will stand before governors and kings on account of him, for a testimony to them (cf. 1:44; 6:11; Mt. 10:18 adds "and the gentiles"). The description of the trial of Christians here given illustrates the persecution activity of Paul (Acts 9:1), but may also reflect Paul's own appearances before governors (Felix, Acts 24, and Festus, Acts 25:1 f.) and kings (Agrippa, Acts 25:23 f.) and the death of James the son of Zebedee (Acts 12:2).

v. 10 The next statement disrupts the connection between v. 9 and v. 11. "And the gospel *must* first be preached to all nations" (i.e., before the end can come). The thought helps the reader to understand why it cannot yet be the "end." It highlights the eschatological "drive" behind foreign missions, as represented by Paul. The idea here stated, that world-wide missionary effort must first be carried through before Christ can return saved Christianity from remaining a Jewish sect, and Jesus from being another "teacher of righteousness" like the one whose fate was mourned by the Essenes of Qumran.

vv. 11–13 When those handing the Christians over lead them (to trial) they need not worry about what they are going to say. The words will be given them. Not they but the Holy Spirit will be speaking (cf. Lk. 12:11). The Greek key word rendered "hand over" leads by association to the placement here of the further sayings concerning denunciation of one family member by the other (cf. Mic. 7:6), resulting in such an extreme as the one that children bring about the death of their parents. (Instances of this kind of thing may have been known when the words crystallized.) They will be hated by all for the sake of Jesus' name (i.e., belonging to him; being Christians). But he who holds out to "the end"—this one will be saved (= delivered).

13:14–20 The Crisis in Judaea (Mt. 24:15–22; Lk. 21:20–24)

vv. 14–20 Now comes the real "sign" (asked for in v. 4). It is the abomination of desolation standing where it (he?) ought not to be. This was familiar phraseology to those who knew the Book of Daniel or other apocalypses making use of it. The Greek phrase was the LXX rendition of the Hebrew *shiqqūṣ shōmēm* of Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11. It was either cryptic by intention of the Hebrew author, or a secondary perversion of what he wrote—out of reluctance to use or to have a pagan divinity's name pronounced in the reading of Scriptures. What was meant in Daniel was the idol (altar?) of *Ba'al Shāmáyim,* "lord of the heavens" (= Zeus Olympios), which Antiochus IV Epiphanes placed upon the altar in the Temple. (Cf. 1 Macc. 1:54; 6:7.) However, in 13:14 the "abomination of desolation" is taken as predictive of an event of Mark's own time or of the immediate future. When he speaks of its "standing where it ought not to be" he is hinting at what Dan. 9:27 portrays as in the Temple. The parenthetical remark "may the reader take note" is curious; it could apply to the reader of the Book of Daniel or to the reader of this new prophecy (implying that this is literary, not spoken prophecy)—perhaps in particular the scribe or teacher (cf. this use of the word "reader" in Ecclus. 1:2).

Some scholars have held that this "abomination of desolation" refers to the crisis of the year 40, when Pilate, under orders, had the Roman garrison bring the imperial standards with images of the emperor into the city in the night (Jos., *Ant., 18,* 3, 1; *B. J., 2,* 9, 2; Philo is quoted by a Church Father as having written in his lost work on the persecutions of the Jews under Tiberius and Caligula, that Pilate actually set the images up in the Temple—a thing Josephus may have omitted intentionally). This may at the time have greatly excited not only the Jews but the Christians of Judaea, and have led to revival of interest in Daniel's prophecy. But when Mark wrote, this was a past incident; only if one assumes that he is taking over a prophecy composed in A.D. 40 is this of any help. It seems preferable, however, to suppose that for Mark "the abomination of desolation" is again a thing either of his present or of the future. Perhaps he expected it to be fulfilled in the (impending?) final siege of Jerusalem. The idea that history repeats itself in the recurrence of such striking phenomena stands in the background of such thinking. (Cf. Josephus, who gives a revised version of the Lord's departure from the Temple in Ezek. 11:22–23 for the time of the siege under Titus, at the occasion of Pentecost, *B. J., 6*, 5, 3.) Perhaps the apocalyptist is thinking of a royal standard.

What is then said in v. 14b does not apply to those resident in Jerusalem, for whom it will be too late, but for those living in the countryside. They are to flee "into the mountains." In 1 Macc. 2:31 the people flee into the hiding places in the "wilderness." What mountains are meant here is not clear—perhaps those of the wilderness of Judah (cf. Heb. "going down upon the mountains," for the Transjordan inclines, in Judg. 11:37). The urgency of the flight is vividly emphasized in v. 16 and a lament is then uttered for women that are pregnant or nursing babes. Let them pray that it (the flight? cf. Mt. 24:20) may not occur in the winter (increasing the hardships). The tribulation will be without parallel since the creation of the world and will not have its equal again. (One is reminded of the saying of Josephus concerning the siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. "The multitude of those that perished therein exceeded all the destruction that either men or God ever brought into the world." *B. J., 6*, 9, 4.) If God had not shortened the days (cf. this idiom, but with respect to individual life, in Prov. 10:27) there would not all (= any) flesh be saved; but he has (mercifully) shortened them for the sake of the elect (Mt. 22:14). This is all apocalyptic prediction, and is not to be interpreted of the crisis of Mark's time.

13:21–23 Admonitions for the Culmination of the Crisis (Mt. 24:23–25). In that period there will be numerous pseudo Messiahs (cf. already v. 3) and pseudo prophets, some of them doing signs and wonders and trying to mislead the elect if possible. (Miracles thus were no proof of divine authority, cf. Ex. 7:11–12.) Again they are warned to "see to it" and that Jesus has foretold it all (in these predictions).

13:24–27 The Second Coming of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:29–31; Lk. 21:25–28). After this tribulation come the supernatural events. The description is based on prophetic and apocalyptic passages in older writings—darkness of sun and moon, stars falling down from heaven, the powers in the heavens being shaken (Is. 13:10; 34:4, LXX; cf. Rev. 6:13). Then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds "with much power" and with glory. He then will send the angels (8:38) to gather the elect from the four winds (Zech. 2:6), "from the end of the earth to the end of heaven." (This is based on Deut. 30:4, LXX, *"from the end of heaven* to the end of heaven," but with the first part of this replaced by the phrase *"from the end of the earth,"* Is. 13:5; Ps. 19:7.) It seems doubtful whether this is anything more than the traditional material about the scattered Jews, applied here to the scattered Palestinian Christians. The use of the phrase "Son of man" in 13:26 cannot carry much weight in view of the Jewish origin of the section.

13:28–29 Parable of the Fig Tree (Mt. 24:32–33; Lk. 21:29–31). One would now expect something about the judgment over the wicked, but the final events are not pursued further. Indeed, in what follows Jesus again speaks of the period *before* the apocalyptic events. He bids them learn a lesson from the fig tree (the characteristic tree of springtime). Just as they know, when it starts to leave out, that summer is coming, so when these things (the tribulations; cf. vv. 3–13) come to pass they may know that he (third person; i.e., the Son of man) is near, yea at the doors.

13:30–32 The Time of the Second Coming (Mt. 24:34–36; Lk. 21:32–33). He predicts in v. 30 that *this generation* (that of Mark?) will see the fulfillment of the prophecy (cf. Paul's consciousness of the shortness of time in so passing a remark as 1 Cor. 7:29). The solemn asseveration of v. 31, "heaven and earth shall pass away, etc." is put here to underline this saying. (However, in Mt. 5:18 and Lk. 16:17 we also find it used with reference to the Law, and this could be the more original application.)

v. 32 In the same breath occurs a modifying statement which clashes somewhat with the prediction of v. 30; Jesus disclaims knowledge of "the day and the hour" of his return—only the Father knows that. This seems to have been added later. The delay in the return of Jesus evidently led to painful doubts, which were allayed by this supplementary saying. On the ignorance of the angels cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Pet. 1:12.

13:33–37 Conclusion of the Discourse (Mt. 25:14, 15b; 24:42; 25:13; Lk. 19:12–13; 12:40; 12:38). A third exhortation to "see to it" (vv. 5, 23) marks the conclusion. They are to be wakeful for they do not know when the time (of the Second Coming) will be. An otherwise unknown parable of Jesus is then utilized, not actually related: that of the man who goes traveling (cf. Mt. 25:14), empowering his servants to act and assigning to each his work and bidding his gatekeeper to watch. Only the gatekeeper's role is developed and that only indirectly in the application. The disciples are bidden to watch in like manner lest the returning master find them asleep; for they do not know in which watch of the night he will return: evening (6–9 P.M.), the middle of the night (9–12 P.M.), or cockcrow (3–6 A.M.). The concluding verse indicates that the admonition to watchfulness is not just for the four disciples, but for all. (Publication of this esoteric material is thus authorized.)

C. THE PASSION NARRATIVE

14:1–15:47 (Mt. 26–27; Lk. 22–23)

This Gospel has thus far been compiled from a great many independent units of material. The Passion narrative, however, gives the impression of possessing real continuity; there is only one small piece that may be regarded as artificially included (14:3–9). The narrative is not composed of an account given by a single traditioner. There are indications that some of the materials were derived from a different source, which varied in certain respects. It is furthermore composed of a string of incidents—originally no doubt separate brief stories. But they have been more clearly connected than usual so that the over-all impression is one of continuous narration. This unity is due to the fact that it was the oft-repeated sacred story of the Church.

How was it possible that Christians should rehearse the tragic history of the death of Jesus? It was not a typical martyrdom story. Jesus was no victim of foreign oppressors or of the ungodly. He was condemned and rejected by the highest religious authorities of his own people, and, it seems, crucified at their request. It was a horrible death. The mere prospect of crucifixion faced by one of their number led the garrison of Machaerus to capitulate to a Roman officer (Jos., *B. J., 7,* 6, 4). The belief that Jesus had suffered this death according to God's will for a certain purpose and had been raised up and thus vindicated is a presupposition of the value placed on the narrative.

14:1–2 The Plot of the High Priests and Scribes (Mt. 26:1–5; Lk. 22:1–2). The decisive events begin two days before "the Passover and the Unleavened Bread." The Jews had a lunar calendar. Passover was celebrated on the night of the full moon after the vernal equinox at the end of the 14th of Nisan and the early hours of the 15th (bearing in mind that the twenty-four-hour day began and ended in the evening), with the Unleavened Bread, or Mazzoth festival continuing to the 21st of Nisan (Lev. 23:6). It was two days before the Passover (which may mean one *plus* and thus have been on Wednesday) that the high priests and scribes sought a way to seize and kill Jesus (quickly) by crafty methods, but by all means avoiding any action on the festival, lest there be a tumult of the people (in view of his popularity with them, 12:37; one may, however, ask whether what they feared was not a rebellion led by Jesus; cf. the remark of Jos. *B. J., 1,* 4, where a rebellion of the Jews broke out at a festival, "for at those feasts rebellions are generally begun"). The introduction cries out for a continuation in which the crucifixion takes place before the Passover, as in the Gospel according to John. That seemingly does not harmonize with the presentation given in vv. 12 ff. that Jesus celebrated the Passover with his disciples.

14:3–9 The Anointing in Bethany (Mt. 26:6–13; Jn. 12:1–8; cf. Lk. 7:36–40). This beautiful incident was originally an independent story of the short type and has been built into this connection by Mark. It originally had no relation to the Passion and has perhaps been artificially transferred to the present scene (cf. Lk. 7:36 ff.).

vv. 1–7 The situation-description states that Jesus was at Bethany in the house of Simon the (ex-) leper, reclining, i.e., banqueting. This shows the completely independent nature of the story. Who was this Simon? How did Jesus come to be at his house? Was Simon his host during the Passion week? What of the sisters Mary and Martha of Bethany (Jn. 12:1 ff.)? All such questions cannot be answered. When the story was first formulated by a traditioner no explanation was necessary. Mark was unable to provide any information, or he would have prepared the way for it at 11:11.

At this occasion, then, a woman came *having* an alabaster (bottle) of myrrh (= oil) of nard. (In Mt. and Lk. nard is not mentioned, and myrrh is to be taken literally as the fragrant resinous oil of a South Arabian "balsam" shrub.) The word "nard," which appears in the Old Testament (Song of Sol. 1:12; 4:13 f.) and is of Persian derivation, meant an essence derived from the root of a species of Valerian that grows in the Himalayas. The narrator asserts it was the genuine article—not some imitation—and very costly, an observation confirmed by Pliny, and not surprising since it had to be brought from so far in the caravan traffic. The woman broke the (neck of the) bottle and poured the contents on the head of Jesus. (Jn. 12:3 rightly elaborates on fragrance.) The disciples expressed dissatisfaction to each other: to what end has this destruction of the ointment happened? It could have been sold for more than three hundred denarii and (the money) given to the poor. They were surprisingly well informed on commercial values, and evidently deeply imbued with opposition to luxury. The idea of laying up treasure in heaven through charitable works was paramount, as no doubt taught by Jesus. They went so far as to rebuke the woman. But Jesus said they should leave her alone, and asked why they inflicted troubles on her? She did a good work "in him" (= with him as object). They would always have the poor with them and would be able to do well (with them) if they wished, but him they would not always have with them.

It seems probable that the story once ended with this saying of Jesus, which constituted a sufficient point. Jesus praised what the woman had done as a "good work," over against the usual good work of almsgiving. John's parallel, too, shows a desire to close with that saying, though he puts a brief hint of vv. 8–9 ahead of it (Jn. 12:7–8). The words "Me you will not always have" reflect no knowledge on Jesus' part that his Passion is imminent, though they do have the implication of separation in a not too distant time.

vv. 8–9 The very nature of the saying of vv. 6–7 invited an extension, in which the proximity of the Passion would be made clear. There was a desire, too, to counterbalance the fact that the body of Jesus had not been anointed before burial. Hence the Easter story describes how three women tried to attend to the matter belatedly. Christian women in particular were painfully aware of this omission of the proprieties. Some others in the Primitive Church saw in the act of the woman of 14:3 an "advance anointing," and this interpretation was therefore appended to the story in words attributed to the Lord himself. He declares: "What she had, she made (use of). She has come beforehand to anoint my body for burial." An Amen-saying adds that "wherever the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world, what she did will be spoken to her memory." This can hardly mean that it should be brought to God's attention (Acts 10:4), but rather to the attention of those who hear the gospel. The late origin of vv. 8–9 is apparent from the phrase "proclaiming the gospel (i.e., the one about Jesus Christ, 1:1) in the whole world." This reflects the great missionary movement, of which Paul was the leader. That the "memory" of the woman should be kept alive presupposes original mention of her name, and an interest of certain persons in promoting her celebrity. From the point of view of the tone for the Passion narrative, vv. 8–9 were a fine addition to make, and by deletion of the woman's name her *act* rather than her *person* became memorable. The "advance anointing," of course, means nothing to the modern reader, since the customs and manners of those days are dead and gone. We think, instead, of the loving sacrifice, and see in it an example of devotion to Christ.

14:10–11 The Betrayal by Judas (Mt. 26:14–16; Lk. 22:3–6). The anointing at Bethany interrupted the continuity of the Passion story. We have seen, however, that 14:1–2 represents a tradition divergent from the rest of the Passion narrative in respect to its chronology. Since 14:10 starts with Judas taking the initiative, this is hardly the original continuation of 14:1–2. We may have some hint of how that introduction was continued in Jn. 11:57, where chief priests and Pharisees give orders that if anyone knew where Jesus was he should let them know. (That of course would not fit with his going in and out of the Temple or visiting in Bethany.)

Judas, we are here told by Mark, went to the high priests to betray Jesus into their hands. They were pleased and promised to give him money (as a reward; nothing is said of his asking for any). He thereupon sought a good opportunity to effect a betrayal. No attempt is made to explain the motives of Judas. Matthew and Luke sensed the problem.

14:12–16 Preparations for the Passover (Mt. 26:17–19; Lk. 22:7–13). This clearly loses sight of 14:2, where it was decided that Jesus must be put to death before the Passover festival. Furthermore, Mark's opening words, "On the first day of the Unleavened Bread (festival) when they sacrificed the Passover (lamb)," are strange at first sight, for according to Old Testament Law the Passover is a distinct festival and is followed immediately by the Mazzoth or Unleavened Bread festival. However, it is quite natural that the people in the Western world, for whom Mark was writing, thought first of the Unleavened Bread festival, since Jews living among them could not sacrifice the Passover lamb. (This was done only at Jerusalem.) But the sacrificing of lambs was not carried out on the actual day of the Passover festival; the time for that was the 14th of Nisan between 2:00 and 5:00 P.M. Perhaps the narrator here is thinking of the 14th as the first day of the festival under influence of Western reckoning of time, according to which the day ran from morning to morning.

On the 14th of Nisan, then, the disciples ask Jesus where he would have them prepare the Passover. It had to be eaten in the holy city itself; the question thus applied only to the house. The assumption is that he has a choice of places. In the same solemn style as in 11:1 f. Jesus, with seemingly exact foreknowledge, tells two unnamed disciples, whom he is sending into the city as his messengers, what will happen. They will encounter a man who will show them a large upper room filled with dinner couches. (This may be identical with the later meeting place of the first Christian community at Jerusalem, Acts 1:13–14.) He bids them make the necessary preparations, which they then did.

From rabbinic sources we know that these involved taking a previously acquired sacrificial lamb to the Temple for slaughter, bringing the skinned carcass away in its skin, obtaining all the other required items including wine, roasting the meat in the oven (which was cylindrical and made of clay, and stood in the courtyard of the house). Allegedly no houseowner in Jerusalem could refuse to lend quarters for this purpose, nor could he accept payment therefor. Unfortunately we are totally in the dark as to how all this could be handled in so constricted a city, to which the pilgrims at this season flocked like a cloud of locusts. Josephus asserts that 256,500 lambs were sacrificed according to a count made under Cestius and that with a Passover group consisting of at least ten persons there were 2,700,200 celebrating (Jos., *B. J., 6*, 9, 3). It sounds wholly impossible from any realistic point of view. It would have eased the situation somewhat if various Jewish groups celebrated the Passover on preceding days. Under other calendar presuppositions than those of the traditional Babylonian lunar calendar it could indeed fall differently. The Essenes of Qumran seem to have celebrated it two days before the official occasion, and some scholars have claimed that Jesus and his disciples did likewise. However, it is difficult to reconcile that with the text of Mark, and judgment had best be suspended concerning a matter as yet insufficiently investigated.

The Last Supper

14:17–25 (Mt. 26:20–29; Lk. 22:14–38)

14:17–21 The Beginning of the Meal (Mt. 26:20–25; Lk. 22:14(21–23); Jn. 13:21–30). After sundown Jesus and the Twelve (fixed term, used although two had been sent ahead in v. 13) arrived. While they were reclining (concerning the custom, cf. p. 311 f.), Jesus in an Amen-saying told the disciples that one of those now eating with him would betray him. In response to their sorrowful questioning, he declared that the betrayer was one of the Twelve who dipped (bread) with him into the one dish (following the Eastern custom of using pieces of bread to grasp morsels of food). The Son of man departs, as is written of him (cf. 8:31), but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed (i.e., though serving the divine purpose the betrayer is still morally responsible). It were better for that man if he had not been born (familiar expression, cf. the pseudepigraphic Book of Enoch 38:2; in rabbinic texts the idiom is "if he had not come into the world"). One may assume that according to this tradition the identity of the betrayer was not revealed, and that he remained with the group during 14:22–25.

14:22–25 The Institution of the Lord's Supper (Mt. 26:26–29; Lk. 22:15–20; 1 Cor. 11:23–26; cf. Jn. 6:53–56). After vv. 12–16 the reader expects to hear about a Passover meal, but there is little to remind him of it. This is because the Passion narrative is a cycle of separate incidents of the story of Jesus, strung together with slight transitional statements. Thus vv. 17–21 show interest only in the forthcoming betrayal, and the situation-description merely sets the stage with mention of Jesus' arrival and a meal, for which only the connection in which this incident is placed suggests a Passover. Luke seems to be more definite in representing the meal as a Passover, and with his immediate reference to the cup and a cup-saying, he may have the first cup of the Passover meal in mind (cf. on Lk. 22:15 f.). Paul's account, though it does not mention the Passover, may presuppose it, since it puts the act with the cup "after the dining" (1 Cor. 11:25). This would fit the third Passover cup, which is known in rabbinic sources as "the cup of blessing"—the very phrase Paul uses when he says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10:16.) The rite with the bread is then imagined as taking place near the beginning of the repast.

In Mark's version, however, the story has lost this close integration into the Passover rites. The two acts are related as though performed in immediate succession. His story, too, like Paul's was no doubt derived from a ritual in use in the Church. If the particular church for which he was writing was that of Rome it may be ultimately derived from Paul's account or from some closely related one used there (provided perhaps by men like Adronicus and Junias, Rom. 16:7). Mark works this independent story of the Last Supper into the general banquet occasion by means of the initial words, which are repetitious (cf. v. 18):

"When they were eating Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke it in pieces and said, 'Take, this is my body' " (Gr. *sôma*). It may be due to the Christian rite, the celebration of which was not bound to the Passover, that the word bread (Gr. *ártos*) is used (even by Paul) instead of "unleavened bread" (Gr. *ázumos*), which one would expect to be employed at this supposed Passover occasion. (Or does it indicate that the link with the Passover is artificial?)

The Hellenistic congregations were evidently much impressed by the report of how Jesus took bread, gave thanks, broke it, and distributed it. The way in which it is stressed (cf. 6:41; 8:6–7; Lk. 24:30) makes it seem as though it had been uniquely his way of presiding at meals. But rabbinic sources show that this was done by others too; Gentiles were merely unfamiliar with the custom. Apparently, however, breaking of bread played no role with the sect of the Essenes, as reported in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the *Rule of the Congregation* (Rule of the Community *Annexe*), the regulations concerning the common meal are set forth as follows:

> When they solemnly meet together at a common table or to drink the wine, and the common table is set and the wine is mixed for drinking, let not anyone stretch forth his hand to the first portion of the bread or of the wine before the priest; for he shall bless the first portion of the bread and the wine, and shall stretch out his hand to the bread first. Next the Messiah of Israel shall stretch out his hand to the bread. Then all the congregation of the community shall give thanks (and partake), each according to his rank. And they shall act according to this statute whenever the meal is arranged, when as many as ten solemnly meet together.

This ordinance evidently provides in advance for the future situation in which the Messiah would be present (as number eleven or twelve?). In actual practice of the day, his place was no doubt left vacant.

Mark gives the bread-saying in simple form—not a word is superfluous. Paul, however, adds "(given) for you." Perhaps Mark does not have that interpretative element here because he has an equivalent for it in the cup-saying and reserves this idea for that climactic position. Eating is not stressed in the saying (though Matthew adds reference to it). The important thing is the taking of the bread.

If Jesus actually spoke the saying in this form, what would it have meant to his disciples? The breaking of the loaf cannot very well be allegorical of his death, for his body was not broken in pieces, and he does not utter the words during the breaking of bread, but at its distribution. If the point lies in the taking, then each one is receiving the body of Christ. It is difficult to see, however, what the bread-saying in this form could have meant to the disciples of Jesus. The words become more understandable in the light of the mystical belief of Paul concerning the Christian community as the body of Christ. They are what they receive; as Paul says, "Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17). But this does not suit the range of ideas of the Synoptic Jesus or of his disciples.

In Mark's ritual the cup-saying has interpretative elements. Since (red) wine provided a better possibility of allegorization, it evidently had attracted greater attention as the ritual developed.

"Taking the cup Jesus gave it to them and they *all* drank of it.

And he said to them: 'This is my blood of the covenant shed for many.' " *"My* blood of the covenant" is harsh grammatically, but is understandable in view of the employment of a scriptural phrase (cf. below). Paul's form of the saying is clearer, but very different. He does not have the parallelism body-blood, but rather body-cup: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (i.e., the covenant constituted through Christ's death). It may be that Paul's version of the cup-saying is more original than Mark's. Since he separates the breaking of bread and the drinking from the cup in point of time, there was no need for the cup-saying to balance the bread-saying. On the other hand, there is a natural drift toward making them parallel in form, and this is fully attained in Justin Martyr's version of about A.D. 150 (so much so that some scholars regard Justin's form, except for the words taken from 1 Cor. 11:25, as the most original).

> Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, and said [This do in remembrance of me]: "This is my body." And likewise taking the cup and giving thanks, he said: "This is my blood" (*Apol., 1,* 66, 3).

Mark's allusion to the covenant shows that the story he used stands within the sphere of the Pauline tradition. What then is the reason for the change of wording in the cup-saying? In part it is the "drift" just mentioned, which led to the parallelism "this is my blood"; and in part it is a desire to connect this cup-saying differently with the Old Testament. In Paul's version a link had been established with prophecy (Jer.

31:31), by stressing the *new covenant* in the blood of Jesus. Mark's source, however, wanted to find a background for it in the Law (the Pentateuch), which ranked far above the Prophets in esteem. His "blood of the covenant" is an allusion to Ex. 24:8 (LXX) where Moses pours a part of the sacrificial blood that had been gathered in basins against the altar and scatters the other part on the people, saying, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you, in accordance with all these words (i.e., those previously read to them from the Book of the Covenant). The act of Jesus is thus like the act of Moses. Moses made the sacrifice immediately relevant to the people; Jesus is making his death relevant for his followers. The phrase "shed for many" is explanatory of that relevance. The thought is of atonement, and "for many" is an allusion to Is. 53:11–12. Matthew clarifies Mark's meaning further by rendering "shed for many *for the remission of sins."* Basically Paul and Mark agree, for forgiveness of sins is an important element in the new-covenant prophecy of Jeremiah, at which Paul hints.

v. 25 An Amen-saying is given in conclusion. It is really a commentary on the drinking of the cup and has affinity with the cup-saying put at the *beginning* of the meal by Luke (22:18). Jesus declares that he will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when he drinks it anew in the kingdom of God. Paul indirectly confirms this by likewise having an eschatological element in his closing words: "You proclaim the Lord's death *until he comes."*

One may well ask whether the bread-saying is not of later origin and whether the cup-saying of Lk. 22:17 is not the most accurate report of what Jesus said at the last meal? The last meal of Jesus then would have been an anticipation of the Messianic banquet, like the meal of the Essenes quoted above. However, as one of the giants among New Testament critics, H. J. Holtzmann, once remarked, the discussion of the original nature of the Lord's Supper leads into a labyrinth, in which more than one road opens promisingly, but none leads over a safely passable bridge. We cannot get behind the sources to any certain view of what Jesus may have said and done at the occasion. The interpretation that was placed upon it in retrospect has overlaid the story. This is but natural, for seen from a vantage point subsequent to the death and resurrection and to the establishment of a Spirit-governed community which regarded the heavenly Christ as its Lord, this meal took on a significance that it could not have had in the night of the betrayal. The decision to repeat it and relate reminiscences of the Passion in connection therewith, was evidently made by the participants, and even led to the inclusion of a command of Jesus, "This do in remembrance of me," in Paul's form of the narrative. Early interpretation of the meaning of the death of Christ soon became fused with the account of the occasion, for Paul states that the gospel he received—certainly within less than a decade after founding of the Church—taught that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." The Communion rite which he reports, even if it be only the version of the Antioch church, ultimately goes back to the Hellenists of Jerusalem, and may be regarded as having been acceptable to men like Peter, James, and John. We may be quite certain that we celebrate the rite to this day in accordance with the intention of the founders of the Christian Church.

14:26–31 On the Way to the Mount of Olives; Prediction of Peter's Denial (Mt. 26:30–35; Lk. 22:39, 31–34). The situation-description of this incident links up with the repast by mentioning the "singing" (the Greek word can also mean "reciting") at the termination of the meal. This *can* be a reference to the fact that the Passover meal closed with (a fourth cup of wine and) recitation of Pss. 115–118, the second part of the so-called Hallel, though one misses the mention of the recitation of the first part of the Hallel (Pss. 113–114) before the meal. The Hallel was certainly not used with an ordinary meal. Before the fall of the Temple in A.D. 70 it was recited only eighteen times a year—once at Passover, once at Pentecost, eight times at Tabernacles, eight times at Hanukkah. It remains possible, however, that the narrator is merely introducing the singing on the basis of the *epikṓmion* of Hellenistic banquet custom.

After the "singing" they went to the Mount of Olives. The reason for this is not given. The fixed underlying fact is that Jesus was arrested on the slopes of the Mount of Olives and the narrative had to get him there. If the Passover celebration should be nonhistorical (thus removing the need for his eating a meal in the city) then the link between it and the scene of the arrest would also be imaginative. From the point of view of the Jewish law, going forth on the night of the Passover is surprising, since one was to stay indoors and in the city overnight. But the Passover meal was supposed to be completed by midnight and a subsequent transfer to other sleeping quarters was permitted. With the huge overcrowding of the city at this season, many must have had to camp outdoors. Jesus and his disciples may also have had to do so. To go to Bethany on the Passover night would have been contrary to custom, since that was regarded as outside city limits.

On the way to the Mount, Jesus predicts to the disciples that they will all be offended (cf. 4:17, i.e., their faith in him will be shaken). He infers this from Zech. 13:7, understood as a prophecy of the Messiah (with a text differing from that of the LXX). God will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered. (When "shepherd" was understood as figurative for "king," the application was obvious, cf. 1 Kings 22:17.) But in v. 28 he then adds the promise that after he is raised (from the dead) he will go before them (at their head? cf. 10:32; or more probably, precede them, cf. Mt. 21:31) to Galilee. It seems unnatural to take this as referring to the Second Coming of Christ. There is no evidence that that event was ever expected within a few days. Some scholars think that this verse is not too firmly anchored in the connection. They can point, too, to the fact that it is missing in a third-century papyrus fragment of the Gospel (P. 3). However, it seems essential for the transition to v. 29. For if Peter boldly avers that he will not take offense even if all (the others) do, this implies that the rest of the disciples *did* take offense, namely by flight to Galilee, while he stayed on—at least for a part of the night. (On the objection to a flight to Galilee on the basis of 16:8, cf. on that passage.) The most natural inference is that Jesus is speaking of his resurrection appearances in Galilee. If the saying is authentic, it excludes the appearances of Jesus at Jerusalem for the tradition followed here.

Rejecting Peter's boastful words, Jesus prophesies that in this very night Peter will deny him three times before the second cockcrow (i.e., the one proclaiming the dawn, the first being around midnight). Peter declares emphatically that if he had to die with Jesus he would not deny him. All his fellow disciples allegedly spoke in the same vein.

14:32–42 Gethsemane (Mt. 26:36–46; Lk. 22:40–46; Jn. 18:1). They come to a place called Gethsemane—a word usually interpreted as "oil press." The localization must have been of interest to the old Jerusalem congregation, and suggests that this incident goes back to a report originating there. It is noteworthy that Luke and John omit the name. It may have attained its familiar form within the manuscript tradition, for the Church Fathers Eusebius and Jerome have a variant name form with a different explanation.

On arriving at his objective, Jesus told the disciples to sit there until (= while) he prayed. He took Peter, James, and John with him (farther up the hill) and began to be fearful and to tremble, telling his intimates that his soul was "full of sorrow unto death" (i.e., so sorrowful because he is at death's door). He bade them remain where they were and went on a little farther. He fell upon the ground (i.e., flat, face to the ground, cf. Mt. 26:39, 1 Cor. 14:25; an abject attitude taken in the presence of the deity and great personages) and prayed that if it be possible "the hour" (cf. v. 41, a term of astrological origin) might bypass him. In v. 31 the prayer is given in direct quotation. He addressed God as "Abba" (an Aramaic word which Mark renders "O Father"), considered so typical of Jesus' prayer that it was even taken over by Greek-speaking congregations (cf. Rom. 8:15). "All things are possible to thee. Take away this cup (figurative for martyrdom, 10:38) from me. But not what I will, but what thou (wilt)." He then returned to the disciples and found them asleep. They therefore could not have heard this prayer, and the report of it is thus a reconstruction. Since Christians saw the Passion foretold in Old Testament allusions and predictions (Lk. 24:27), this prayer may also have been suggested by passages of Scripture (e.g., Pss. 42:5, 11; 43:5; Jon. 2:1) in combination with inference from Jesus' general attitude, as known to those close to him.

Jesus rebuked Simon (only use of this name for him since 3:15) for being unable to watch for an hour (i.e., a short time; "weighted" as in vv. 35 and 41), and added the warning to all to be on their guard and to pray that they might not come into temptation (cf. Mt. 6:13). (The ancient reader must have inferred that if the disciples had prayed as Jesus prayed, instead of sleeping, they would not have been overcome, as they soon were, by the temptation of "taking offense," 14:27.) An apt saying is added about the flesh being willing but the spirit weak. (Luke's omission of it suggests that it may be a proverb, rather than an original saying of Jesus.) Twice more (so Mark relates, following ancient narrative style) Jesus went to pray; each time he returned to find the three disciples asleep. The third time he said: "Do you sleep on and rest? It is enough (of such sleeping)." This does not connect well with the next statement that "the hour has come, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners," but reaches out to the command succeeding it: "Arise, let us go. Behold the one betraying me is at hand." The intervening words are then best regarded as added for the purpose of lending greater impressiveness to the story. The allusion to "sinners" means the Gentiles (cf. Gal. 2:15). The fact that no rejoining of the other disciples is mentioned, but that they are considered present in what follows casts doubt upon the special taking along of the three.

14:43–52 The Betrayal and Arrest (Mt. 26:47–56; Lk. 22:47–53; Jn. 18:2–11). While Jesus was yet speaking, "Judas, one of the Twelve" (the unnecessary identification indicates that this was originally a separate report of the incident) arrived; with him was a "crowd" armed with swords and clubs, sent by the high priests, the scribes, and the elders. This build-up of numbers may be only dramatic staging by the narrator, for the aim of the Jewish leaders was to seize Jesus as quietly as possible (14:2). The sole function of Judas was to lead the agents of the high priests to the right place and to point out the right man. He had given those whom he was guiding a sign: the one whom he would kiss was Jesus. He had urged that they seize him and lead him away securely. (This implies that there was no large crowd.) The kiss of salutation was not unusual, especially among teachers, or pupils and teachers. If the teacher was seated, one might kiss him on the head; if standing, one might kiss his knee, hand, mouth (this perhaps in delight over his teaching). In approaching Jesus in this normal manner, Judas would allay suspicion. The armed men, not visible a few feet away in the orchard, could then leap forward and seize him.

Judas' words of v. 44 suggest the possibility that Jesus would try to escape. But since no disciple could have known what Judas had said to the constabulary, this is to be regarded as a motif derived from popular narration. The seizure of Jesus was immediately carried out.

A strange element in the story is the report that "one of those standing about" (not, then, a member of the Twelve? cf. v. 51) drew a sword (presumably a short one that could be concealed; cf. Judg. 3:16) and struck at a servant of the high priest. This indicates that there was some kind of a melee. Shall one infer that the followers of Jesus were actually bent on making him king (Jn. 6:15; 12:13)? Such a supposition would make the role of Judas psychologically understandable: he betrayed Jesus to extricate himself safely from a doomed venture. But this would mean that tradition has concealed or altered a great many things in the history of Jesus. An armed disciple is not unthinkable —particularly if he were a Zealot like the Simon of 3:18 (cf. also Lk. 22:36). The attempted resistance may be attributed to ignorance as to the nature of the attack.

Robbers were common enough on the edge of the Judaean wilderness (Lk. 10:30).

The blow of the swordsman allegedly cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. The item may be subsidiary information, worked into the narrative, for Jesus evidently does not know about it or pays no attention to it. He is quite properly concerned with his own seizure. He declares that he is being dealt with as though he were a robber. When he had daily been in the Temple teaching (cf. 11:19), they had not seized him. But (this had to take place) that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. What passage he had in mind is not stated; Is. 53:12 was quoted in some versions of the events (Lk. 22:37).

Realizing the official nature of the seizure, the disciples left Jesus and fled. That they lingered near the city is improbable. Their own peril must have moved them to put as much distance behind them before daybreak as possible. Only Peter seems to have lingered for the greater part of the night and then he, too, must have fled. At that, he may have reached Galilee first.

A peculiar item is added in v. 51 about a youth who had followed along (there thus were others besides the Twelve; cf. v. 47) and who had an outer garment of fine linen (Gr. *sindōn,* a word derived from Sind, or "India," the home of this type of cloth). He was seized, but was able to get free from his captor by leaving his garment in the latter's hands. That he fled "naked" should not be taken too literally. An undergarment (tunic) was always worn. One must assume that this youth was a known person when the story first took shape, yea that he is the original traditioner for the episode of the arrest. His name has, however, been deleted (cf. 14:3 for another instance of that) or intentionally left in obscurity. The guess (entertained only by moderns, not by the Church Fathers) that he was John Mark is unlikely (see above p. 36).

14:53–72 Jesus before the Synedrium; Peter's Denial (Mt. 26:57–75; Lk. 22:54–71; Jn. 18:12–27). The section 14:53–72 combines two incidents: (1) 14:53, 55–66 and (2) 14:54, 66–72 in the manner first observed in 5:22–43. The first dwells on the trial and the second is concerned with Peter's adventures. The former is basically necessary; the latter is supplementary. Putting the two elements together in this manner seemingly made Peter the authority for what had happened at the trial of Jesus. It is difficult, however, to see how he could have known what was going on in the council chamber. Note that Luke completes the story of Peter's denial before the trial.

v. 53 (story 1) Jesus was taken to the high priest's house. The man's name is not mentioned by Mark; perhaps he did not know it. Matthew supplies it, but John differs. To this house the "high priests" (i.e., the ex-high priests and members of the families having persons eligible for the office; cf. Acts 4:6), the elders, and the scribes were convoked. This implies a meeting of the Synedrium. If this were the regular Passover night it seems almost unthinkable that such a meeting could have been held. If it were only Passover for certain sectarians like the Essenes (cf. on 14:12–16), that difficulty would disappear. But there are other objections. Could the Synedrium meet at night? According to rabbinic sources a case involving capital punishment could be tried only by day, and a verdict of guilty could not be rendered on the same day. Could the Synedrium meet in the house of the high priest? According to rabbinic sources its original meeting place was the "hewn-stone chamber" in the Temple, but there is a report that it was transferred from there to a store (Heb. *ḥānūth*). It is worthy of note that John knows of no Synedrium meeting at which Jesus was tried, but has his death decreed at an earlier meeting (Jn. 11:47–50).

v. 54 (story 2) Peter followed the band escorting the prisoner. He bravely ventured into the high priest's courtyard, where he sat warming himself by the "light" (i.e., fire on a stand or brazier kept going to provide light).

vv. 55–65 (story 1) The high priests and the whole Synedrium sought testimony for the purpose of putting Jesus to death, but did not find (any). A man could be condemned only on the evidence of *two* witnesses (cf. Deut. 17:6). These were heard separately. In any legal case the witnesses were cross questioned: (*a*) as to time and place of an occurrence; (*b*) as to accompanying circumstances. Disagreement on any point disqualified any pair of witnesses. In the case of Jesus the witnesses failed to agree.

A number of men then brought forward an alleged saying of Jesus about tearing down the Temple and replacing it in three days with another not made of hands. Mark calls it false witness, and it may be malicious twisting of 13:2; in Jn. 2:18–22, however, the saying is described as actually spoken by Jesus, but with different meaning. While the witnesses evidently agreed on the saying, they must have tripped up on the accompanying circumstances, so that no case could be built on their testimony.

The high priest now took a hand. Stepping into the midst of the (semicircular) assembly and hence in front of the prisoner, he asked Jesus if he had no reply to this charge. Jesus remained silent. The high priest then asked him whether he was the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, i.e., God. Since there is no indication in Jewish sources that the phrase "Son of God" was used as a Messianic title, this is evidently a Christian formulation, but one showing knowledge of the Hebrew term "the Blessed" or "Praised One" (used, e.g., in the invitation to prayer in the synagogue: "Praise the Lord, the Blessed"). Jesus answered: "I am, and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of 'the power' (a substitute term for 'God') and coming with the clouds of heaven." He thus alluded to both Ps. 110:1 (cf. 12:35 f.) and Dan. 7:13–14. The high priest now rent his garment (a sign of grief and horror) and asked the assembly why there was any need of witnesses. They have heard the blasphemy! Thereupon they all (but cf. 15:43) agreed that Jesus was deserving of death. According to Mark some of the council members spat at him, covered his face (this is omitted in some manuscripts), and struck him with fists, saying, "Prophesy." (Did Jesus describe himself as prophet Messiah?) In Luke's version this violence is ascribed to those holding Jesus captive (Lk. 22:63).

The account of Jesus' trial renders the Passion story dramatic. The version given by Mark is, however, far from convincing. It is hard to reconcile with Jewish law and legal procedures. We have already referred to the difficulties of time and place. To these may be added the questions: (1) whether a Messianic claim on Jesus' part constituted blasphemy; (2) whether a Messianic claim once admitted did not require further cross-examination; (3) how the scruples of the Pharisees in the Synedrium could be overcome to agree to sentence of death on these grounds (contrary to the impression given by Mk. 3:6, 11:18, the Pharisees were very reluctant to support death penalties where their legality was in doubt); (4) why the sentence was not stoning to death, which was customary in the case of blasphemy and required no Roman consent. Such objections compel one to regard Mark's account as *only an attempt to reconstruct what had happened* after the arrest of Jesus. The saying attributed to Jesus in v. 62 was not derived from any oral source, but is the fruit of the study of Old Testament prophecy. Its evidence is of little use for the question whether Jesus called himself "Son of man."

vv. 66–72 Story 2 is now continued. One of the handmaidens of the high priest, seeing Peter warming himself, accused him of having been a companion of Jesus the Nazarene. He denied knowing what she was talking about, but drew back to the vestibule for easier egress. The girl, seeing him (keeping her eye on him?), informed the bystanders that he was "one of them." Peter "again denied." After a little while the bystanders repeated the girl's allegation, and gave the reason that he was a Galilean (inference from his speech? Mt. 26:73). Having lied, Peter's peril was now the greater, so he went to the extreme of invoking curses on himself if he were not speaking the truth, and swore that he did not know this man about whom they were speaking. Just then the second cockcrow sounded. Remembering the prediction of Jesus (14:30), Peter *began* to weep. (So understood by Codex D, Itala, Old Syriac, and a 12th century Byzantine exegete. Mt. and Lk. evidently took it to mean "he went forth"; R.S.V. "he broke down." More in line with Gr. use of the verb is "putting to it [his mind] he wept." Mistranslation from Aramaic improbable.) The curtain is therewith drawn on Peter. It seems likely that he, too, fled to Galilee, if 14:28 can be relied on.

15:1 Jesus Delivered to Pilate (Mt. 27: 1–2; Lk. 23:1; cf. Jn. 18:28). "Early" (i.e., 6:00 A.M.) the entire Synedrium held a council (i.e., formulated charges? The reading of the Codices S and C favors that interpretation, while Codices A and B suggest that a fresh meeting was held. This would agree with the rule that a sentence involving capital punishment could not be given in less than two days). Binding Jesus (who then, prior to being condemned, was unbound) they took him away and handed him over to Pilate, who was at Jerusalem for the holidays (in view of possible uprisings at these occasions).

15:2–5 The Trial before Pilate (Mt. 27: 11–14; Lk. 23:2–5; cf. Jn. 18:29–18:38a). The governor's interest naturally is in the political aspect of the case. He asks the prisoner (against whom charges of plotting rebellion must have been made) whether he is the king of the Jews. (The phrase is peculiar; the thought is of a king made as foreseen in Jn. 6:15. "King of Judaea" would be the expected title of an appointed ruler; cf. Lk. 1:5.) For Jesus to answer affirmatively would have been to incriminate himself. He replied evasively with, "*Thou* sayest." (That it is not an admission is suggested by the fact that Pilate does not follow it up.) The high priests now accused him, bringing up details. Jesus having made no defense, Pilate asked him whether he had no reply to all that he was being charged with. But Jesus gave no answer, so that Pilate (unaware of the scriptural necessity of this; cf. Is. 53:7) was astonished (at such absence of any will to defend himself).

15:6–15 The Sentence of Death (Mt. 27:15–26; Lk. 23:17–25; cf. Jn. 18:38b–19:16). The Barabbas incident is now introduced. Mark states that it was customary to release a prisoner to the people at the festival, and that the choice was left to them—a custom not mentioned by Josephus or in the Talmud. Since rebels were arrested every now and then, and of course were patriots in the eyes of the people, the liberation of such a one could be regarded as a concession and engender good feeling. The agitation to ask for the liberation of a certain Barabbas may have been going on for some time; it was supported by the high priests. Pilate's effort to get the people to accept the liberation of Jesus thus had no chance of success. His question about what he should do with Jesus, whom they call "king of the Jews," had an element of irony which only infuriated the crowd to clamor for crucifixion. So Pilate released Barabbas, had Jesus scourged, and handed him over (to the soldiers) for crucifixion. (Scourging was a regular preliminary to that.)

15:16–20 The Mocking of Jesus (Mt. 27: 27–31; cf. Jn. 19:1–3). The preceding scene took place outdoors. Jesus now was led into the hall (Gr. *aulê* which Mark calls "the praetorium." This was not the name of a building, but was given to any place where a praetor (or Roman magistrate, in this case Pilate) chose to sit in judgment. It is a moot question whether the Antonia on the north side of the Temple or the palace of Herod is meant; the latter is the more probable because "hall" suits a residence better and because we are specifically told that a later governor stayed there (Jos., *B. J., 2,* 14, 8). Certainly the Roman leaders availed themselves of the best accommodations in Jerusalem, in a building situated where western breezes provided pure air. The soldiers called together the entire military unit (Gr. *spéira*—this can mean either a cohort of six hundred men, so Acts 21:31, or a "maniple" of two hundred men, which would have been a suitable escort for Pilate in coming from Caesarea; cf. Acts 23:23). They then performed a mockery with Jesus. Giving him a garment of "purple" (red) and weaving a thorny crown, which they set upon his head, they began to hail him with: "Greetings, O king of the Jews!" They smote his head with a rod, spat at him and did obeisance, as before a king. That this was not merely directed at Jesus as a person is indicated by all that is known about rising anti-Semitism in the Roman empire.

15:21 On the Way to Calvary (Mt. 27: 32, Lk. 23:26–32; cf. Jn. 19:17). A man from Cyrene in North Africa, coming from the field (implying agricultural activity; cf. 13:16), was compelled by the soldiers to carry the heavy "cross." (This can only mean the so-called *patibulum,* or crossbeam; the post was a stationary one at the site to which they were going.) The man's name is given as Simon and he is referred to as "the father of Alexander and Rufus." These two persons must still have been known to Mark's readers. A Rufus "eminent in the Lord" was a member of the church at Rome in Paul's time (Rom. 16:13), and it is possible that he is one of the two mentioned. They must have contributed much of the knowledge of the crucifixion as they had heard it from their father. We thus may regard this story as particularly reliable.

15:22–32 The Crucifixion (Mt. 27:33–44; Lk. 23:33–43; cf. Jn. 19:18–27). The place to which Jesus was brought was Golgotha, which name Mark interprets as "place of the skull" (Aram. *gulgultā,* skull; note loss of an "l" in Gr. transcription). Here Jesus was offered a drink of wine with myrrh added (for sedation), but refused to touch it. On crucifying him the soldiers cast lots to divide up his garments —an element of the story that may have been inferred from "prophecy" (Ps. 22: 18).

The crucifixion took place at the third hour (9:00 A.M.). The inscription, declaring the crime for which the sentence had been imposed, read: THE KING OF THE JEWS. (One must assume that it was written in Greek—Latin being little used in the East; Jn. 19:20 claims it was trilingual.) Two robbers were crucified, one on either side of Jesus. (The received text, cf. A.V., here quotes "he was numbered with the transgressors," Is. 53:12, as supporting prophecy, but this is omitted in the best manuscripts; Luke quotes that saying in 22:37.) Those "passing by shook their heads" (Ps. 22:8), and ironically remarked concerning the alleged saying of Jesus of 14:58, adding, "Let him save himself, descending from the cross (and thus prove his power)." The high priests with the scribes spoke similarly, remarking that he had saved others, but could not save himself—(he) the Christ, the king of Israel! (The last words could be joined to the next sentence as subject.) Let him descend from the cross that they may see and believe. Even the two robbers crucified with him reviled him. (Luke corrects that in 23: 39 f.)

15:33–41 The Death of Jesus (Mt. 27: 45–56; Lk. 23:44–49; cf. Jn. 19:28–30). Around the sixth hour (noon) a darkness came upon the whole earth (land? cf. Heb. *ereṣ,* which can mean either one) until the ninth hour (3:00 P.M.). This suggests a solar eclipse, but none such can be calculated for the time of a Passover full moon; it may just be a narrative embellishment, or another case of inference from prophecy (Amos 8:9). At this time Jesus "with a loud voice" cried out the words of Ps. 22:2, but in Aramaic rather than in Hebrew. (This may be due only to the fact that Mark is following an Aramaic report of the crucifixion.) Some who stood by jested that Jesus was calling Elias —the would-be Messiah calling for his forerunner. (This indicates that the textual reading *Hēlei, Hēlei* in Matthew, reproducing Heb. *Ēlī, Ēlī* is better than *Elōi, Elōi,* which, while Aramaic, is less like the prophet's name, Elias, Heb. *Elīyāh.* In Codex D and the Western text the Hebrew verb form for "forsaken me" is used instead of the Aramaic one.) A certain one (of the Roman soldiers) thereupon (in fulfillment of Ps. 69:21) put a sponge, which he filled with vinegar, on a rod—for the cross was high—and gave Jesus to drink (to prolong his life). The text states that he said, "Wait, let us see if Elias will come to take him down." This is rather an improbable thing for a Roman soldier to say, and the Old Syriac reads "they said," making it a comment of the bystanders. It must be admitted, however, that the effect of the cry of Jesus is dimmed by this scoffing, and so it is a question whether v. 35 and v. 36a are not secondary expansion of the story.

The death of Jesus is reported in only a few words: He gave a loud cry and expired.

A twofold "sign" is said to have attended the death of Jesus. First, the curtain of the Temple (at the entrance to the "house"; cf. on Lk. 1:8 ff.; Heb. 10:20) was rent asunder from top to bottom. It is as though the Temple were personified as a man who rends his garment in horror (Mt. 26:65). The second sign is the miraculous conversion of the centurion, who declares, "Truly this man was the Son of God." What Jewish lips would not utter (not even Peter's 8:29; contrast Mt. 16:16), but what God had declared (1:11; 9:7), and the demons had cried out (3:11) that the Gentile spoke first and spontaneously, on the basis of what he had seen on Calvary. It is as though in these two signs the end of the old order and the beginning of the new were being indicated and celebrated. The curtain of the Temple rent asunder—a grim omen to readers who were living in the days of the siege of Jerusalem! A Roman soldier was the first fully "Christian" confessor! This must have given satisfaction to the Roman readers, for whom Mark probably wrote, and offset the painful fact that Romans had mistreated Jesus and crucified him.

The narrative, with an eye to 15:42 ff., mentions women spectators, who looked on from afar. Three of them had already accompanied and served Jesus in Galilee, but there were others who had joined his following, when he went to Jerusalem. The first of the three was Mary the Magdalene, i.e., from Magdala north of Tiberias. The second of those named was Mary (the daughter? cf. on 16:1) of James "the little" (not "the younger"; cf. the Rabbi Shemuel "the little," Heb. *haqqātōn* mentioned in rabbinic sources) and mother of Joses (short form of Joseph; cf. Mt. 27:56). (In Jn. 19:25 she is replaced by a "Mary of Clopas.") Joses at least must have been alive and able to add his mother's recollections when this story took shape in the Palestinian Church. That the three women had served Jesus in Galilee (presumably providing support for the prophet, after the example of 1 Kings 17:8 ff., 2 Kings 4:8 ff.) was not mentioned in Mark's account of Jesus' ministry; but cf. Lk. 8:2–3.

15:42–47 The Burial of Jesus (Mt. 27:57–61; Lk. 23:50–56; cf. Jn. 19:38–42). The opening words of this story of Jesus' burial, "[It having already become evening,] since it was the preparation day, that is the 'pre-Sabbath' (Gr. *prosábbaton*) . . ." cause difficulty. The Sabbath began when the sun had set on Friday, and the word "evening" suggests the time *after* sundown, when it could no longer be the "day of preparation." Matthew retains the first time-indication, but removes the second, while Luke utilizes the second later in 23:54. It seems as though Mark's story presupposes only the second time-indication, that it was the pre-Sabbath, else how could what then is related have been carried through? Perhaps Mark's first time-indication comes from a variant story. The peculiar formulation in Acts 13:29, according to which *the Jews* took Jesus down from the cross and laid him in a tomb, suggests that there were divergent stories of the burial. (In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter the Jews take Jesus down and give him to Joseph.) The purpose of the mention of the day of preparation was evidently to show the necessity of having Jesus laid away before the Sabbath began. It may well be asked whether the concern about that is not inconsistent with the Passover dating of the crucifixion, for that festive day had not expired yet before sundown.

The main figure in the present narrative is Joseph of Arimathea (a town Eusebius puts nine miles north of Lydda, cf. Acts 9:32). He is described as a prominent councilor (Mt.: a rich man) who also was waiting for the kingdom of God (cf. Lk. 2:25, but here perhaps in the sense of a near-convert to discipleship). He ventured to go to Pilate to ask for the body of Jesus. His act took courage because it was not without risk to show oneself to have been a friend of a man crucified as a revolutionist. The Roman was surprised that Jesus was dead. (This certainly does not fit a situation in the evening if Jesus had been dead since 3 P.M. Joseph might be expected to have made his request immediately after Jesus' death.) Pilate sent for the centurion and on receiving confirmation gave Joseph the body. The law of Deut. 21:23 decreed that "the body of a hanged man shall not remain on the tree overnight lest the land be defiled thereby." Doubtless the soldiers would have seen to it that Jesus was interred, as they must have done in the case of the two robbers.

But a more dignified burial was in order for Jesus. It was a pious "good work" in the best sense, which a man like Joseph of Arimathea undertook, to provide proper burial for one widely esteemed as a prophet (Lk. 24:19).

As it was customary in decent burial to wrap a body in a linen garment (14:51) Joseph bought one for this purpose. The statement causes perplexity, because buying and selling were not to be done on a holiday. It is a question, however, whether the tradition is accurately reproduced—it may merely have stated that he "took" a linen garment (cf. Mt. and Lk.)—and even if it is correctly given, one cannot be sure that exceptions could not be made for funeral exigencies.

Joseph then took the body from the cross, wrapped it in the linen garment (omitting the customary prior washing—which the apocryphal Gospel of Peter mentions—and the anointing, perhaps owing to the necessary haste before the beginning of the Sabbath), laid it in a tomb hewn from the rock, and rolled a stone before the entrance of the tomb. It must have been a new tomb since there was no stone in front of it, though one was evidently held in readiness. No light is shed here on the natural questions about ownership and location of the tomb; even the Fourth Gospel, though it has a tradition on the latter point (Jn. 19:41), does not clarify the former. Matthew, however, drew an inference as to ownership (Mt. 27:60).

The story closes by noting that Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses (misleading abridgment of the identification in 15:40? Codex D and the Old Syriac have "Mary of James") saw where he was laid. This verse was probably added to the burial story by Mark for the purpose of indicating how the women knew where to go on Easter morning. The women also conveniently serve the function of witnesses (the fact that two persons were customary for that role may account for the omission of the third woman of 15:40), though another man as witness would have been better. (The Fourth Gospel supplies him and drops mention of the women.)

THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE

16:1–20 (Mt. 28; Lk. 24; cf. Jn. 20–21)

16:1–8 The Empty Tomb (Mt. 28:1–10; Lk. 24:1–11; cf. Jn. 20:1–2). This story, which must be classified as a sacred legend, was originally independent of what precedes, but Mark found it a fitting conclusion for his narrative. He left the beginning intact; the women are introduced as though they had not been mentioned before (cf. 15:40, and two in 15:47) and the second is called "the Mary of James." As a woman was referred to by her father's name one should understand this as meaning "Mary the daughter of James." (Cf. Salome daughter of Simon, who is joined with her husband Hadar son of Judah in the sale of a house, in a contract of A.D. 135—the time of the Barcochba revolt—found by Bedouin in 1952 in connection with the Dead Sea Scrolls explorations.)

When the Sabbath was over (i.e., Saturday after sundown) the three women bought spices (which they mixed with oil) to anoint the body of Jesus. The story thus reflects the knowledge that Jesus had not been anointed before burial, as did 14:3–9. (The latter story was an attempt to provide a substitute for an anointing, but evidently failed to satisfy in the long run.) "Very early, on the first of the Sabbaths" (here meaning "days of the week") they came to the tomb when the sun went up. ("Very early" suggests *before* sunrise, and it is worthy of note that both Matthew and Luke follow that indication, leaving out the sunrise.) As they neared their objective they asked one another who would roll away the stone for them from the entrance of the tomb?

It seems strange that this thought did not engage the women before they ventured forth. Certainly Joseph of Arimathea should have been informed and asked to aid them. The reason for his not being mentioned is that this story is independent of the previous one, which in turn had nothing about the women in it until Mark worked in the item about them in 15:40–41. Not only is the story weak in this particular; it raises the question whether the thought of anointing the body of a dead man on the third day could have been entertained by Jewish women. Considerations of this sort may have led Matthew to drop this element of Mark's story (Mt. 28:1), and Luke to avoid direct mention of any purpose of anointing. If the idea of an anointing of the body is improbable, could any practical reason exist for going out to the tomb? A rabbinic source, though not contemporary, reveals that one went to "visit" the dead up to three days, to make sure that the buried person was not alive. In that connection it is said that in doing this one need not be concerned about heathen custom—a statement seeming to imply that this was a practice of Gentiles in some Eastern quarter. It is attractive to assume that this custom was the germ out of which the story of a visit of the women to the tomb evolved.

Looking up as they approached, they saw to their surprise that the stone had been rolled away. The story adds, "for it was very large." One might expect this to have been mentioned in v. 3 instead of here. The reason for the remark at this point is perhaps that here was proof of what they did not yet understand, viz., that Jesus with superhuman strength had rolled it aside when he issued from the tomb. Entering the tomb, which thus must have been four to five feet high—a fact explaining the great size of the stone needed to cover the entrance—they saw a "young man" (Gr. *neanískos*), clad in a white garment (Gr. *stolḗ*) sitting on the right (on the rock-hewn shelf made for a body). While the word "angel" is not used, this is what is meant, and he is not imagined as winged. (Our artistic representations were influenced by the Psyche figures of Hellenistic art.) The women were frightened, but the young man told them not to be. Speaking for them in their paralyzed state he said that they were seeking Jesus the Nazarene, the crucified one. He declared that he was not here and pointed to the place where "they" had put him. (In 15:46, Joseph was acting alone; a plurality of persons seems to be presupposed in the version hinted at in Acts 13:29.) If the young man was seated on a shelf at the right, there must have been another shelf on the left side of the tomb, to which he could point.

In v. 7 we meet an element that Mark has probably added to the self-contained received story: the women are told to go and tell the disciples, and (especially) Peter (note reversal of the order of 1 Cor. 15:5), that Jesus was going before them into Galilee (cf. on 14:28), and that there they would see him as he had told them. That this is an addition is revealed by the fact that the women do not carry out the command given them, and that they show no appreciation of the joyousness of the news of which they are to be the bearers. It was, however, a very important and valuable addition to make from Mark's point of view. It veiled the fact that none of the disciples was present at Jerusalem on Easter morn.

The women fled from the tomb, for trembling and amazement possessed them. They said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.

The story in its original form made the women the recipients of the resurrection announcement. They had allegedly received it from an angel in the empty tomb early on Easter morning. Their fright is the typical reaction of those who have seen a heavenly being. No message for others was given them—merely the information that Christ had risen. That they said nothing to anyone is the excuse of the original narrator for bringing forward the story belatedly. Not appearances of angels, but assertions of having had visions of the risen Lord himself had held the stage while leading witnesses were alive. Paul gives us the roster in 1 Cor. 15:5–8. Any traditions about these visions, however, had one defect from the point of view of the author of a Gospel narrative—they had occurred in Galilee. Was no witness of Christ's resurrection given at Jerusalem on Easter morn? How could one know whether he was not still in his tomb when people were having visions of him in Galilee? The story of the women who had found the tomb empty and had received the angelic announcement of the resurrection provided a suitable answer. Mark gave it credence and found it a useful conclusion for his Gospel. It spared him the difficulty of introducing a change of scene and of giving explanations about what had become of the disciples after 14:50. By injecting into it the prophecy of appearances of Jesus to the Twelve and to Peter in Galilee he was able to end his narrative with a hint of mysteries still untold.

There thus may be a grain of truth in the claim of the new Mar Saba fragment of Clement (see p. 34) that Mark had knowledge of things he did not relate. He may have considered stories of the resurrection appearances as *arcana* (i.e., things sacred and incommunicable). Indeed, that may have been the apostolic attitude. Paul nowhere relates how he saw the Lord, but merely bears witness that he did. He even draws the veil over a different kind of vision that was accorded him (2 Cor. 12: 1–5). Mark was still close enough to the Apostolic Age to entertain an idea of resurrection visions in which the risen Lord was seen in unearthly manifestation or in dazzling light (6:9; 9:3). This kind of vision could not produce the stories about a Jesus who talked, walked, and ate with his disciples, as told in the later Gospels. If that be so, then it is hard to see how Mark could have gone any further than he did. His chief concern was to tell of the earthly ministry of the Son of God, in which his divine nature was revealed, as through a transparency, and of the Passion in which he suffered for the sins of many, and of his divine vindication through the fact of his resurrection. Proclamation of that victory by God's angel sufficed. It was the appropriate point at which to lay down his pen. A younger generation could later relocate, historicize, and humanize the resurrection appearances, but not the man who knew something of the awe with which the original witnesses had spoken of them.

THE LATER CONCLUSION OF MARK

16:9–20

In the received text used by the A.V., Mark does not end with 16:8, as is the case in the best manuscripts, but has a conclusion relating appearances of the risen Lord. This is an outline of the resurrection appearances compiled from the other three Gospels, but contains some independent touches.

vv. 9–11 Jesus appears to Mary (as in Jn. 20:11–18). She carries the news to "those who had been with him." Their mourning is stressed, and also their unbelief, following Lk. 24:11.

vv. 12–13 The appearance of Jesus in "another form" (Gr. *morphē;* cf. on 9:3) to "two of them as they were walking in the country" is then recorded. This of course rests on Lk. 24:13–35. Again the unbelief idea is invoked, perhaps under influence of Lk. 24:37 f., 41.

vv. 14–18 The third incident is the appearance to the eleven (Lk. 24:36 f.) who are chided for their unbelief and hardness of heart.

At this point, after v. 14, Codex W introduces the so-called Freer-Logion (cf. p. 9).

> And they answered and said, "This world-age of lawlessness and faithlessness is under the Satan, who does not allow the true power of God to seize upon the things (made) unclean by the spirits. Therefore reveal thy righteousness already." So spoke they to the Christ and the Christ said unto them: "The limit of the years of the dominion of Satan is (about) fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near, and for those that sinned I was delivered unto death that they may turn to the truth and sin no more; that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven." *

Use of "the Christ" shows that this is an insert, but it is evidently very early in origin—perhaps taken from some lost Gospel. The disciples here defend themselves against the rebuke of v. 14, pointing to the reign of Satan, which does not permit the true power of God to prevail. Jesus declares that the limit of Satan's reign has (about) been reached, but that some terrible things are still in store (cf. Rev. 12:7–12). (The main thing, however, is) that Christ has suffered for the sinners, who now can turn to the godly life and inherit the glorious righteousness stored up in heaven (cf. Rom. 3:23 f.).

In vv. 15–18 we have a revised version of the great commission of Mt. 28:18–20, plus a verse dealing with the signs accompanying the apostolic preaching. (Cf. Lk.

---

* Quoted from Sir Frederick Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* p. 215. (See Bibliography.)

10:17–19. For the picking up of serpents cf. Acts 28:3–5.)

vv. 19–20 The ascension is then related (cf. Lk. 24:50–51) and to that is added a succinct statement about the disciples going forth to preach everywhere, the Lord working with them and providing confirmation by miracles.

A different, very short conclusion is also found in some manuscripts of Mark.

> All the things which were told them they delivered briefly to those about Peter. After these things Jesus himself from east to west sent forth through them the holy and incorruptible proclamation (Gr. *kérygma*) of eternal salvation (R.S.V. n.).

This addition took care of the criticism that the women did not carry out the angel's command. The existence of early acts of individual Apostles is presupposed. The "gospel" is here imagined as concerned with the eternal salvation of man.

The Gospel according to Matthew

The Sources

The modern study of the relationship of the first three Gospels has shown that Matthew used Mark and a hypothetical source scholars call Q, and that he also had available some special material not found in Mark or Luke. But the narrative framework with which Matthew's main edifice was constructed was derived from Mark (see p. 14). In chs. 3–4 he follows Mk. 1:1–20, but greatly enriches the latter's account. In proceeding further he is bent on first exhibiting Jesus as teacher and then as wonderworker. He therefore introduces the mighty Sermon on the Mount in chs. 5–7, and in chs. 8–9 a whole series of miracles derived from Mark (chs. 1, 4, 5, 2), but abridged and rearranged. From 12:1 on (= Mk. 2:23), the Marcan order of events is followed more conservatively. In addition to the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew has compiled other extended discourses of Jesus: the charge to the disciples, 10:5–42; the parable discourse, 13:3–52; the discourse against the scribes and Pharisees (ch. 23); and the apocalyptic discourse, impressively expanded with parables, 24: 4–25:46. In the case of four of these, he has indicated that each section has been concluded (7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 26:1), as also at the end of two shorter speeches (18:3–20, 23–35) in 19:1.

Rich as is Matthew's contribution to the words of Jesus (thanks chiefly to Q), he possesses little additional information about Jesus' ministry or about his Passion. What he offers on that score in the body of the Gospel, stimulating as it is, hardly adds to dependable knowledge (cf. 14:28–31; 17:24–27; 27:3–10, 52–53, 62–66). There remain his contributions to the preliminary history: the genealogy, and the stories of the Magi and of the Egyptian sojourn (1:1–2:23); and to the post-resurrection narrative: the bribing of the soldiers, and the appearance of Jesus to his disciples in Galilee (28:11–20). Although these materials, for which Mark furnished no help, have added a great deal to the charm and power of the book, they are of value to the historian chiefly as testimonies of the impact of Jesus on his followers, and of the faith and life of the author and of the Christian group he represented.

The Standpoint of Matthew

Since Matthew evidently sought to supplant Mark, the question arises: What led him to do so? Was it to fuse Mark and Q, thus to provide a single document containing both? That reason may have been operative, but it is hardly the only one. Matthew is writing for a different Christian constituency, and has a different slant from Mark. The latter wrote primarily for Gentiles (see p. 34). Matthew's concern is with Greek-speaking Jewish Christians. Unlike Mark, who cannot presuppose much knowledge of the Old Testament on the part of his readers, Matthew indulges in frequent reflective quotations from it to substantiate that Jesus is the promised Messiah, and that many events of his life were foretold. He is a sort of Christian rabbi. Although Matthew portrays the Pharisees as the main opponents of Jesus, his own Christianity has a Pharisaic stamp. He is imbued with the same ideal—righteousness—but he represents Jesus as demanding a righteousness better than that of the Pharisees (5:20; 23:23). The criticism of the latter is based primarily on their legalism, casuistry, and hypocrisy. The emphasis Jesus lays on good works, notably those of an eleemosynary nature, is Pharisaic, but is coupled with warnings against regarding them as producing merits.

Another vital element in Matthew is the thought of discipleship—of following Jesus, acting as he acted, loyal to him in suffering and martyrdom. A problem already discernible in Mark—the delay in the expected return of Christ in power as Son of man and as Messiah—is of much concern to Matthew. He meets it by counterbalancing apocalypticism with the idea of the Church, which in one instance is even called "the kingdom of the Son of man" (13:41). Indeed, he puts these two things in close relationship with each other. For while the Last Judgment is viewed as universal, the interest is focused exclusively on the phase dealing with the Church membership. The Church contains both wheat and tares, and the latter cannot be eliminated now by any human agency (Mt. 13:24 f., 36 f.). The separation must await the final assize (25:30).

It is important to see how Matthew deals with his received materials. What he omits, adds or changes reveals something about his own views or purpose. We may observe in his reproduction of Mark's stories the tendency to abridge the narrative element, and especially to delete anything that is colorful or of human interest. There is, as it were, a retrograde movement from the elaborate story to the simple one (cf. p. 19 f.). Thereby the central element—usually the dialogue between Jesus and the person or persons involved—receives the attention, whereas the narrative aspect is made peripheral.

Matthew regards the miracle story as conveying a teaching, and uses it if it furnishes something of value for the themes of faith, discipleship or Christology. The two miracle stories of Mark that he omits (Mk. 7:31–37; 8:22–26) gave him no opportunity to bring forward any spiritual content after a possible drastic pruning of external particulars. The miraculous happening as such is passed over lightly by Matthew. He has grouped most of the miracle stories together in chs. 8–9, and this arrangement reveals something of his thought. He has placed them here to illustrate in advance the kind of things mentioned in the reply of Jesus to the question by John the Baptist (11:5). If the sending out of the disciples is put after the miracle stories and before the embassy of the Baptist this may suggest that their miraculous activity, which corresponds to that of Jesus himself and of course extends into the history of the Primitive Church (10:7–8), is further proof of Jesus' power and Messiahship.

In the case of Matthew's handling of the Q material, we may note a mixture of conservatism and innovation. In most cases Luke gives Q in more simple and hence more original form; for it is easier to understand that a saying should be made more elaborate than that it should be simplified. Matthew is fond of certain fuller locutions, e.g., "birds of heaven" instead of "birds." On the other hand, Matthew occasionally preserves an original phrase which Luke has modified. As previously remarked (see p. 15), the order of the Q document is preserved more clearly by Luke, whereas Matthew has taken the liberty of drawing on Q sayings regardless of their original context to put them wherever it may suit his purpose.

The Readers

Where is the group to be sought for which this Gospel was compiled? The Anti-Marcionite Prologues (or prefaces to the Gospels, which originated in Asia Minor, A.D. 150–180) assert that it was written in Judaea. It is a question whether this is anything more than an inference based on its Jewish-Christian character. If there were real tradition behind this report, Judaea would not necessarily be meant in its narrower sense. That name is often used broadly to include Galilee (Lk. 1:5, etc.), and one might reason from the Gospel's account of the appearance of the risen Jesus in Galilee that it actually originated there. Judaea proper seems an unlikely area of origin because of the difference between Matthew's Easter story and Luke's. The latter was written about the same time as Matthew's and doubtless gives the Easter tradition of the Jerusalem church of the day (see p. 260 f.)—a tradition at variance with Matthew and Mark. But were there Hellenistic-Jewish communities in Galilee after A.D. 70? Our information is much too meager to permit of an answer. Generally speaking, Syria (4:24) offers a more likely field. Antioch in particular deserves consideration because this Gospel stands close in spirit to the Didache, a Christian church-order of *c.* A.D. 98–130, which is believed to come from that area. Matthew's emphasis on the authority of Peter (16:18) would also be most understandable if the book originated at Antioch, for Peter seems to have carried on activity there as the head of missions among the Hellenistic Jews (Gal. 2). Early legend even considered him Antioch's first bishop. Attractive as the supposition of Syrian origin is, there is no way of proving it. The only tangible fact is that the author of the Gospel, and presumably his readers, stand close to Palestinian Judaism in their thinking, and are still much governed by the antithesis to Pharisaism—though in no such fundamental way as Paul. The Pharisaism which the author reflects is that of the period after A.D. 70, at which time it had become dominant and growing increasingly hostile to Jewish Christians. The latter, however, are not disposed to give up their heritage in Israel.

The Author

When this Gospel became widely accepted in the second century, it was attributed to Matthew. Perhaps at this time the name of Matthew was substituted in 9:9 and 10:3 for that of Levi the son of Alpheus (cf. Mk. 2:14). The editors of the Gospel collection may then have introduced it also in Mk. 3:18. That the book bore any name prior to receiving its official designation seems unlikely, since this writer, like Mark but unlike Luke, completely effaces himself. If churchmen ascribed it to Matthew, their decision must have been due to tradition and not to internal evidence.

A report of literary activity by a disciple named Matthew appears first in a quotation preserved by Eusebius from the writings of Papias (*c.* A.D. 130).

> Matthew compiled the oracles (Gr. *lógia*) in the Hebrew (probably meaning Aramaic) language and everyone (i.e., every bilingual missionary reading them in public worship?) translated them (orally) as best he could (*Eccl. Hist., 3,* 39).

This was interpreted by Irenaeus and other Fathers to mean that Matthew was the author of a Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel, of which our present one is a translation. (The creation of the latter then relieved readers of lessons of the burden of oral translation.) But Papias speaks only of "The Oracles," and that raises doubts whether he is thinking of the present Gospel or not. He himself wrote a work of five books bearing the title *Exegesis of the Lord's Oracles,* and says that he depended more on what he received orally from those who had known the Apostles than on what was written in books. That the present Gospel according to Matthew was written by an original disciple is improbable from its very nature, since it is dependent on previous sources such as no eyewitness of the ministry of Jesus would have needed. The words of Papias, therefore, would seem to refer to a different book. Those who feel that there must be some basis for the ecclesiastical title are wont to argue that Matthew was the author of Q. This is purely speculative, however.

Date

There are but slight indications as to date in this Gospel. Obviously it was later than Mark since it uses the latter as a source. Time must be allowed for the spreading of Mark through the churches and for the rise of a desire, on the part of the constituency represented by Matthew, to replace Mark. The Gospel looks back on the destruction of Jerusalem (22:7). There are indications that Christians were again living there and were able to point out the place of a happening (27:8), and there is knowledge of a long-standing Jewish claim that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus from the tomb during the night (28:15). The prediction of persecution of Christians (5:11; 10:17–18; 25:36, 39), which is put into the mouth of Jesus, is no doubt set down with an eye to what had already occurred. But one must hesitate to go much beyond A.D. 85 for the date of the Gospel, since it presupposes that some of the people who had known Jesus were still alive and would live to see his return (16:28). Matthew would probably have omitted this saying had there been no survivors of that generation. The hope was finally restricted to one lone personage, who outlived all the rest (Jn. 21:22 f.). Even a youth like the one of Mk. 14:5 would have been only a septuagenarian by A.D. 85. Assuming that Mark was written *c.* A.D. 70 and the Gospel according to John, representing a more advanced development in Christian thought, *c.* A.D. 95, a date of *c.* 85 seems reasonable for Matthew.

MATTHEW

THE INFANCY NARRATIVE
1:1–2:23

1:1–17 The Genealogy of Jesus (Lk. 3:23–38). The New Testament has two genealogies of Jesus—this one in Matthew and the one of Lk. 3:23–38. Neither is dependent on the other. Eusebius devotes a long discussion to the divergences between them. In it he gives some quotations from Sextus Julius Africanus (an Eastern theologian, who lived in Palestine for a time before A.D. 221), one of which is of special relevance. According to Africanus "those belonging to the master" (Gr. *despósunoi,* i.e., his relatives), who had scattered from Nazareth and Kochaba into the rest of the world, gave the genealogy of Jesus according to their record, as faithfully as they were able (*Eccl. Hist., 1,* 7). It seems highly probable that Matthew's genealogy was derived from one thus promulgated by a descendant of one of the Lord's brethren.

The opening words, "Book of the origin (Gr. *génesis*) of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham," are not the title of the Gospel but only of the genealogy. The phrase, "book of the origin of," is modeled on Old Testament language (Gen. 5:1, etc.) of the LXX; the original Hebrew phrase, "book of the generations of," views a genealogy from the standpoint of the *ancestor,* while the Greek rendering, "book of the origin of," views it from the standpoint of the last *descendant,* whose name could therefore be put in the title. The mention of Abraham as (ultimate) father is important: here is no mere emphasis on monarchy and dynasty, such as the title "son of David" might suggest, but rather on a sacred story starting with the divine calling of Abraham and the promise of blessing to all peoples of the earth (Gen. 12:1 f.) and culminating in Jesus.

We see a thoughtful mind at work in the organization of this genealogy. V. 17 divides it into three times fourteen generations: (1) Abraham to David; (2) David to the Exile; (3) the Exile to Christ. Therein the author sees a symbolism. The mystical numbers in their perfect symmetry lend the genealogy and the history it reflects an aura of pre-established harmony. That this numerical symmetry was bought at the price of dropping a few names, which, pedantically speaking, ought to have been included in the sequence, did not matter particularly to the ancient reader, who was as willing as the modern one to take the author's word for it. The fact is, however, that in Part 2 of the genealogy, three names—Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah—have been dropped before Uzziah (1:8), and one between Josiah and Jechoniah (= Jechoiachin). For the latter was not the son of Josiah; that ruler was the father of Jehoiakim and his successor-brothers (Jehoahaz and Zedekiah), and Jehoiakim was father of Jechoniah (who, contrary to v. 11, had no brothers). In Part 3, the list of the descendants of Jechoniah-Jehoiachin as given in 1 Chron. 3:17–24, is considerably abridged, for with the more recent ancestors of Joseph tacked on, it would have become much too long. This section now contains only thirteen names instead of the fourteen claimed. Originally, Jesus must have stood last as number 14; the genealogy, therefore, ended with him and was intended to be his, as v. 1 stated.

The mention of women in the genealogy follows the pattern set by 1 Chron. 2:4 for its first-mentioned one, Tamar. If Salmon (= Salma, 1 Chron. 2:11) begets Boaz *with Rahab* (the harlot of Josh. 2:1) this report is without Old Testament foundation, and must be based on some unknown apocryphal tale. That Boaz begat Jobed (= Obed, 1 Chron. 2:12) with Ruth (Ruth 4:17) calls attention to the fact that Obed, too, was the offspring of an irregular union—a levirate marriage—and not the child of Boaz' own wife. That Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, is mentioned as mother of Solomon, again calls attention to an irregularity in the pedigree. It is sometimes thought that these references to women reflect the fact that Jesus was defamed by the Jews as having been irregularly born. In all the instances except that of Rahab, the prominence of the biblical story and the example of 1 Chron. 2:4 suffice to suggest the mention of the woman, and one cannot see any particular relevance in the reference to Rahab. However, it may be conceded that these allusions help to prepare the reader for 1:18 f.

The most peculiar part of the genealogy is the statement of v. 16: "Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, out of whom (fem.) was begotten Jesus, the one called Christ." We have already inferred from the omission of the fourteenth name that the genealogy must once have stated that Joseph begat Jesus. This had to be changed because the Gospel was going to include a story according to which Joseph was not the begetter of Jesus. That this view defeats the purpose of the genealogy—to show Jesus' Davidic descent—is obvious. The Church Fathers argued that Mary, too, was of the house of David, claiming that, among the Jews, women had to marry within the same clan (Num. 36:6); but this law applied only to the case of daughters who inherited their father's estate (cf. Num. 27:1–11). It was characteristic of the second-century Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians, who by that time had declined to a heretical sect called the Ebionites, that they held Joseph to be the father of Jesus. It is improbable that this was an innovation—it was previously held by their predecessors of apostolic times. For Paul, too, Jesus was of the seed of David according to the flesh (Rom. 1:3). A genealogy obtained from the Jewish-Christian quarter could only have had for its point to prove the Davidic lineage of Jesus via Joseph.

It is significant that there are several different manuscript readings for v. 16; the fact indicates that the passage has been much tampered with. One Uncial manuscript and Codex D in its Latin rendering, some Old Latin manuscripts as well as the Old Syriac have, with minor variations, "Jacob begat Joseph; being betrothed with him the virgin Mary bore Jesus, the one called Christ." The Sinaitic Syriac has a reading that has otherwise disappeared: "Jacob begat Joseph: Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begat Jesus called the Messiah." This takes us closest to what the received genealogy must have had according to the formula used in vv. 3, 5, 6: "Joseph begat Jesus out of Mary."

1:18–25 The Birth of Jesus. Matthew now proposes to relate the birth (again Gr. *génesis,* but not of descent as in 1:1) of the Christ. (The name "Jesus" is probably not original here; cf. the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions.) Actually, however, he only offers an account of Joseph's marriage and acceptance of an as yet unborn child not begotten by him. No indication is given as to the place of Joseph's residence. In the subsequent story he is imagined to have been a resident of Bethlehem (2:1, 22–23). He betrothed to himself one Mary, whose parentage is not given (a gap in the information which later legend was eager to fill).

According to rabbinic sources, betrothal was an arrangement made between the groom and the bride's father. A girl would become engaged at twelve to twelve and one-half years of age, while the groom might be eighteen to twenty-four years old if he aspired to wed a young girl (Heb. *na'arāh*). A legal contract (Heb. *kethubbāh*) was set up regulating the arrangements. This was followed by the formal engagement. On that occasion the groom, in the presence of two witnesses, would give the bride a coin, declaring that she was thereby betrothed to him. Her acceptance of the coin bound her. From then on she was legally the man's wife—the marriage was only the finalization of what had thus been arranged. The twelve and one-half-year-old bride was, however, given an engagement of a little over twelve months.

In this period between betrothal and marriage (the "coming together" of v. 18), the Christ's mother was found to be with child "out of the Holy Spirit." By giving this explanation in advance, Matthew thrusts aside any possible aspersion. According to later Jewish custom, which in all probability was no different from that of this period, the matter of an engaged girl's pregnancy had to be brought to the bridegroom's attention by her father. The situation placed Mary in jeopardy, for since she was legally Joseph's wife, the penalties of the law (in this case Deut. 22:23 f.) applied. However, Pharisaic legal practice had occasionally "made void the word of God" (Mk. 7:13)—in this case quite laudably! It was necessary under Pharisaic rules to prove with witnesses that adultery had occurred, and the witnesses had to prove that they had warned the pair to desist. Had Joseph (the injured party, legally) brought this case to public attention he would probably have achieved no conviction. The story notes that he was a righteous (and hence merciful) man, and that (because of this) he did not want to make Mary a "public example" (cf. Col. 2:15). Yet, as a righteous man he also could not wed a woman that had seemingly broken the legal relation established by the betrothal. He therefore decided to dismiss her (by a bill of divorce, which had to be signed by witnesses and formally handed to the bride or her father). But while planning to take this action he had a dream, in which an angel appeared to him and directed him to do otherwise. He is addressed as "son (here = descendant) of David," perhaps because what the angel is about to say directly concerns the Davidic house. He then receives the explanation which 1:18 had anticipated. Said the angel, "That begotten in her is out of the Holy Spirit."

From the angle of Palestinian Judaism this explanation of Mary's pregnancy is anomalous. It is, however, in line with thought found in Hellenistic Judaism, and evidently came from that quarter. There the Spirit is "life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor. 15:45). There, too, a tendency existed to rule out human paternity in the births of a few great personages of early Hebrew history, such as Isaac, Esau and Jacob, and Gershom, as shown by Philo Judaeus (*De cherubim*, 45–47). This in turn was, perhaps, a thought produced under the influence of the pagan belief that the life of a great man (cf. Heracles and Alexander the Great) should begin supernaturally. In ancient estimation it required divine or semidivine procreation for a human being to do superhuman deeds (cf. Gen. 6:4). But the idea could also be applied to men of genius like Plato, who was allegedly begotten of Apollo and whose mother had no intercourse with her husband until after his birth. Christianity could not accept mythology, but the claim of a procreation of Jesus by the (as yet impersonal) Holy Spirit satisfied the ancient requirement, and at the same time remained chaste and inoffensive.

The angel informed Joseph that Mary would bear a son to whom *he* should give the name Jesus. "He will deliver" (translation of the name "Jesus") "his people *from their sins*"—an unexpected twist from the angle of Messianism, in which the Messiah was primarily a national deliverer from the foreign yoke (cf. Lk. 24:21; Acts 1:6). All this happened, Matthew solemnly declares, in order that Is. 7:14 might be fulfilled. He quotes the passage in its LXX form, in which the word "virgin" (Gr. *parthénos*) was used in rendering the "young woman" (*'almā*) of the Hebrew original. (Mt. has "they shall call," instead of "thou shalt call"; the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll has "one shall call.") This translation made a Messianic interpretation of the child Emmanuel (Heb. *Immanuel*) attractive, and dictated that Jesus, in order to be regarded as the Messiah by Greek-speaking peoples, had to be described as born of a virgin. Why the LXX translators had given that rendering is a subject on which one can only speculate. It seems probable that they were influenced by knowledge of a myth, such as demonstrably existed in the ancient world, of the birth of a divine babe by a virgin goddess. A similar event, they may have reasoned, was required in the human sphere to constitute the extraordinary sign promised to King Ahaz. In this manner the way was prepared in advance for the formation of a Hellenistic-Christian legend of the virgin birth of Jesus.

Joseph acted at once; he went and received "his wife" (into his own house), but had no intercourse with her until she bore a son (a statement implying that he did have such subsequently; cf. the remark above about Plato's mother). *He* (contrast Lk. 1:31) called the child's name "Jesus." The story therewith implies that to outward appearances Joseph acknowledged paternity of the child. The very different nativity story of Luke shows that here we are not on the certain ground of historical narration.

2:1–12 The Wise Men from the East. This story reveals by its introduction that it once had an independent existence. It is not the continuation of a nativity story, but begins afresh to relate happenings subsequent to that event. The birthplace of Jesus is referred to as "Bethlehem of Judaea" (in contrast to the Bethlehem of Galilee) and the time is given as "in the days of Herod the King." Magi—originally a Median priestly caste—from the risings (of the sun) came to Jerusalem. Their number is not stated—that we think of them as three is due to later legends, which went on to make them kings and to give them names. They asked: "Where is the king of the Jews that has been born? For we have seen his star in the East and have come to bow down before him."

That a portent should indicate an event of such vast significance as the birth of a child of destiny was a very natural assumption of the ancient mind. According to Plutarch, the birth of Alexander the Great was marked by the burning of the temple of Diana at Ephesus; the Magi present at that city smote their countenances and cried out that the day spelled misfortune for all Asia. The portent attending the birth of Jesus is the appearance of a (new?) star. A prophecy spoken by a seer who had come from the East had predicted the rising of a star out of Jacob (Num. 24:17). The figure of speech, taken literally, could readily produce the idea that a star would attend the birth of the Messiah. The modern successors to Balaam were the Babylonian astrologers, and Babylonia being under Parthian rule, the Iranian Magi were easily fused or confused with astrologers. The idea of a coming of such Magi to Palestine may have been suggested by a historical incident that in the light of its description by Dio Cassius must have profoundly stirred the people of Syria two decades before Matthew wrote: the journey of Tiridates I, brother of the Parthian king Vologases I, himself a Magian and attended by Magi, to Rome in A.D. 66 to pay homage to Nero and to receive the crown of Armenia.

Herod and all Jerusalem were startled at the question of the Magi about the newborn king of the Jews, for this meant that Herod's Idumaean house would not endure. He convoked the scribes—for everything concerning the king of the future was of course revealed in advance by God in the sacred books, of which these men were the expert interpreters. The scribes pointed to Micah 5:2 (in a form varying slightly from both the Heb. and the LXX translation), according to which the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem. The hypocritical Herod bade the Magi go there and then report back to him if they found the child. The charming naïveté of this suggestion—a frightened king would certainly have given them an escort—is exceeded only by that of the star's reappearing and leading the Magi (on a star leading the way, cf. Virgil, *Aeneid,* II, 694 f.) and becoming stationary above the very house where the child lay. The Magi rejoiced at sight of the star, went into the house and found the child with its mother (no mention of Joseph). They thus could pay homage to the right infant, and bring their gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Here the story has probably been influenced by Is. 60:6 and Ps. 72:10–11, for the gifts mentioned are South Arabian products. That the Magi-astrologers brought gifts of that kind did not seem unnatural, however, for, to the ancients, Sheba and Chaldea were not so far apart as they seem to us (cf. Gen. 10:8). Being warned in a dream (Matthew avoids mentioning that an angel appeared to them), they departed by another way, and did not go back to Jerusalem as Herod had requested.

This story could hardly have arisen in the Primitive Church of Palestine, for Palestinian Judaism was antiastrological because of Deut. 4:19. It was obviously produced among Greek-speaking Jewish Christians, who absorbed influences from the Hellenistic environment in which they lived. Aside from its perennially delighting the Christian mind, it has had two further repercussions: (1) futile attempts to use an astronomical phenomenon such as the conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in 6 B.C. for a dating of the birth of Jesus—so Kepler and numerous modern imitators; (2) a tolerance of the superstition of astrology even in some enlightened quarters, e.g., by the Humanist and coadjutor of Martin Luther, Philipp Melanchthon.

2:13–23 Flight to Egypt and Return

vv. 13–15 The story of the Magi cries out for a continuation. What did Herod do? How did the babe escape his search? How did Jesus come to be Jesus of Nazareth rather than Jesus of Bethlehem? Because the life of Christ was believed to have been foretold in detail in the Old Testament the answers were to be found in some of its stories and prophecies. The babe of destiny had to be hidden (cf. Ex. 2:3). Joseph is directed by an angel in a dream to go to Egypt with his family and to stay there until told to leave. The prophecy of Hos. 11:1, "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (originally applying to Israel) evidently suggested the Egyptian sojourn of the Christ child.

vv. 16–18 Herod orders the slaying of all children up to two years of age in Bethlehem and in all its territory, "according to the time which he had ascertained from the Magi." This "time" was not mentioned in 2:1 f., but the story here implies that the star had already been seen by the Magi—and the child born—a year or more prior to their arrival. Perhaps the underlying thought is that the infant had to be a year or two old before being taken on such a hard journey as the one to Egypt. The slaying of the (male) children was suggested by Pharaoh's example (Ex. 1:22)—no doubt through a popular version of that story which stressed the prediction of the birth of a babe of destiny (cf. Jos. *Ant., 2,* 9, 2). The nearness of the tomb of Rachel to Bethlehem, already accepted in Matthew's time, brought to mind the "prophecy" of Jer. 31:15. In Jeremiah's own day her burial place was believed to be near Ramah, north of Jerusalem; in the New Testament period a place with this common name (Heb. *rāmā* "height") south of Jerusalem may have furnished an excuse for relocating the tomb.

vv. 19–23 True to his promise, the angel again appeared to Joseph in a dream, when Herod died, and bade him go to "the land of Israel" (biblical phrase instead of "Judaea"). Those who sought the child's life were now dead (cf. Ex. 4:19). Apparently en route Joseph learns of the appointment of Archelaus (4 B.C.–A.D. 6), who had received the rule of Judaea, and fears to go there (i.e., back to his house at Bethlehem)—wherein lies an echo of this ruler's ill-repute. He is warned in a dream (mention of the angel omitted as understood?) and withdraws to the district of Galilee, to a city called Nazareth. (In 4:13, important manuscripts read *Nazara.*) This had to come about in order to fulfill what was spoken through the prophets: "He will be called Nazoraean (Gr. *Nazōraíos*)."

This term is found not only here and in 26:71, but also in Luke, John and Acts, while Mark regularly speaks of Jesus as the Nazarene (Gr. *Nazarēnós*). English Bible translations do not differentiate the two spellings, assuming that Nazoraean is the same as Nazarene. On a purely biblical and philological basis one can argue that Nazoraean is a dialectic form of Nazarene, for the change from "a" to "o" is characteristic of Galilean Aramaic, and the variant form of the name of the city, Nazara, would readily yield the adjective Nazoraios. But the Church Fathers speak of a Jewish-Christian sect called the Nazoraeans, and in the books of the Mandaeans, a sect still existing in Iraq, their group is called Nazoraeans. As the Mandaeans revere John the Baptist and as their writings show no Christian influence, this term can certainly have no connection with the city of Nazareth in their case, but evidently means "the ones observing (certain rules)." The question then is whether Nazoraean, as applied to Jesus and to a Jewish-Christian group, is not an indication of a link with the sect of John the Baptist. Scholars were about ready to discard this possibility when a great number of further Mandaean texts began to become available through the researches of E. S. Drower (since 1953). One of these, the *Haran Gawaitha,* indicates that the sect emigrated from Palestine to Haran at the time of the Parthian king Artaban, and there is reason to believe that Artaban III (A.D. 12–28) is meant. One thus will have to concede the possibility that "Nazoraios" was originally distinct from "Nazarene." "Jesus the Nazoraios" would have been a party designation, just like Pollio the Pharisee (Jos., *Ant., 15,* 1, 1). But if so this was hardly clear to the New Testament writers.

Matthew puts his proof from Scripture for Jesus' being called "Nazoraios" very generally. He appeals to what was spoken through "the prophets." He is thus not quoting a single allusion, but is summarizing freely, thinking of several. It is generally assumed that the word "shoot" (Heb. *nēṣer*) in Is. 11:1 is the main peg for this statement. If the text originally had Nazara instead of Nazareth, the author may have been thinking of the Isaiah passage in an Aramaic translation, in which the final consonant of the emphatic form of the word meaning "shoot" (Aram. *niṣrā*) could be written with a final *h,* as *nṣrh* just as Nazara must have been; then one could easily understand how this visual identity would seem most significant. The author may also have considered the "branch" of Jer. 23:5 and Zech. 3:8, 6:12 synonymous with "shoot" and thus have entertained the conviction that "the prophets" had foretold the Messiah's being "the shoot." The rabbis of the Talmud indulged in similar artificialities. Matthew needed a prophecy here to find some justification for the fact that Jesus, whom he has described as Bethlehem-born, was called the Nazoraean. The answer was: It was so predicted and therefore it had to come to pass.

Matthew's Infancy narrative was composed without knowledge of the traditions received by Luke. While from 3:1 ff. both authors enjoyed guidance by Mark, they here, as in their supplementary post-resurrection narratives, go their separate way. Matthew's yields but scant dependable fact. We may glean that at the time of his writing, Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians held Jesus to be the son of Joseph and stressed his Davidic descent, while Hellenistic Jewish Christians were accepting the idea of a virgin birth. The latter assertion elicited Jewish defamation of Jesus as illegitimately born. Matthew's story is an apologetic against such defamation. That Jesus was born in Herod's time (30 B.C.–A.D. 4) seems probable, but is rendered somewhat uncertain by Lk. 2:2. In making Joseph a resident of Bethlehem who moved to Nazareth, Matthew's story represents a later standpoint than Luke's, which seeks to explain how Jesus the Nazarene could have been born in Bethlehem of Judah. In both cases the belief that the prophecy of Micah 5:1 ff. had to be fulfilled provided the decisive stimulus.

PART I THE GALILEAN PERIOD

3:1–18:35 (Mk. 1–9; Lk. 3:1–9:50)

3:1–6 John the Baptist (Mk. 1:1–6; Lk. 3:1–6). With the convenient connective phrase "in those days," Matthew leaps a gap of about twenty-five years and takes up the story where Mark begins it. He does not, however, repeat Mark's striking but difficult introductory statements. He calls John "the Baptist" (rather than "the Baptizer") and says he made his appearance preaching in the wilderness *of Judah* (Mk.: "in the wilderness"). This term, which is the name for the mountainous region west of the Dead Sea and of Jericho, is here stretched to include part of the plain southeast of Jericho. Matthew diverges more from Mark in another respect. John's message is not paraphrased but given in direct quotation: "Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is near" (which is not the same thing as preaching "a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," Mk. 1:4). In using the phrase "kingdom of the heavens" instead of "kingdom of God," Matthew is following a custom well known also from rabbinic texts. (It was basically an abridgment of the phrase "God of the heavens" and was rendered all the more inviting by a desire to avoid the word "God," even as one studiously avoided using the old divine name "Yahweh.") Matthew declares that this John was the one spoken of (by the Holy Spirit) through the prophet Isaiah (40:3), thus bringing in here what Mark has so cumbersomely put in v. 2. Like Mark (and Luke), he changes the words "make straight the paths of our God" to "make straight his (the Lord's = Christ's) paths." The Malachi prediction which in Mark is prefixed to the Isaiah quotation does not appear here. For the rest, Matthew adheres closely to Mark except that he rearranges the material. The account of John's garb and food (Mk. 1:6) is put ahead of the report about his audience (Mk. 1:5). In the case of the latter, Matthew adds to the areas from which they came "all the country of the Jordan."

3:7–10 John's Preaching of Repentance (Lk. 3:7–9), Q. Matthew enriches the account of the Baptist's ministry with material from Q. He quotes what John said to many of the Pharisees and Sadducees, who came to the baptism. (Luke, perhaps adhering closer to the source, gives the same material as spoken to "the crowds.") Calling them a "brood of vipers," he asks who encouraged them to think that they could escape from "the wrath to come" (a general term for the Last Judgment; cf. 1 Thess. 1:10) by participation in the rite. He demands that they bring fruit (cf. Phil. 1:11) worthy of repentance (i.e., act in a manner corresponding to the change of heart implied in repentance). The continuation suits an address to the crowds better than one to Pharisees and Sadducees: they should not think of saying in themselves (i.e., in their thoughts) that as children of Abraham they are safe (and that the judgment would be only upon the Gentiles; cf. 2 Esdr. 13:37). "God can raise up children to Abraham from these stones." (There will have to be children of Abraham who escape the judgment, owing to the promise of God to Abraham, Gen. 12:1 f., etc.; but were all Israel to perish, God could create a new Hebrew people by mere fiat.) The allusion to creating out of stones, instead of "out of dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7) was originally a pun—"sons" and "stones" being very similar words in Hebrew and Aramaic—and the thought of stones may have been suggested by 4:3; however, a mythological background cannot be ruled out (cf. the story of how men and women were created when the flood hero and his wife threw stones over their shoulders, Ovid, *Metam., 4,* 139 f.).

The ax, John says, already lies at the root of the trees; actually it can lie at the root of only *one* tree, but the one stands as the first of many that are to be felled. The figure is evidently taken from life; the orchardist, planning to chop down dead or dying trees, leaves his ax at the root of such a tree for later use, being occupied presently with other work—pruning, etc. Every tree that does not give fruit (the adjective "good" is omitted in the Sinaitic Syriac, perhaps rightly) will be cut down and cast into the fire. (Similarly, everyone not doing righteous works will be judged by God.)

3:11–12 John's Preaching Concerning the Messiah (Mk. 1:7–8; Lk. 3:15–18), Q. Matthew now gives John's message of the Messiah, enriching Mark's account with further Q material. John states that he baptizes with water unto repentance (the "remission of sins" phrase of Mk. 1:4 is thus left out as that evangelist's interpretative contribution), but the mightier one coming after him, whose sandals he is not worthy to *carry* (Mk.: "unloose the thongs" of), will baptize them with the Holy Spirit *and with fire*. The last mentioned phrase, though not in Mark, is vindicated by Luke, and hence must have stood in Q. Actually the Baptist may only have spoken of him who will "baptize with fire (i.e., destroy)." Since Jesus had "baptized" with Holy Spirit, as the early Church had experienced, Mark has the Baptist predict that, and stops there. Matthew, however, restores "with fire" and brings in further material which he shares with Luke: "Whose threshing-flail is (already) in his hand; he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor (by threshing the grain) and gather his wheat into the storage place (Gr. *apothēkē,* used also as loan word in rabbinic texts), but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" (allusion to Is. 66:24, showing that the figure refers to the divine judgment).

Matthew has thus brought the Baptist forward more vividly, and by identifying his message of the nearness of the kingdom with that of Jesus (3:2 and 4:17), he has given him an abiding significance for the Church.

3:13–17 The Baptism of Jesus (Mk. 1:9–11 (Lk. 3:21–22; cf. Jn. 1:31–34). Having previously mentioned Jesus' home town, Matthew can omit reference to his going away from Nazareth, but he makes clear that Jesus' departure from Galilee was for the purpose of being baptized by John. Matthew adds some special material of his own in vv. 14–15. Allegedly, John sought to hinder Jesus from going into the river by protesting, "I have need of being baptized by thee and (instead) thou comest to me." This, according to Matthew, presupposes that John recognizes in Jesus the one who will baptize with Holy Spirit and fire (3:11), and knows that his own preparatory mission is now at an end. Jesus tells him to "let it be so now, for it is fitting for (both of) us to fulfill all righteousness." These words are not clear at first glance. They can hardly mean that a mere formality must be carried through by both. There must be virtue in John's action in baptizing the Messiah as well as in Jesus' submission to baptism. With the words "Let it be so now," Jesus persuades John that his Messianic ministry has not yet begun, and that therefore John's objection to baptizing him does not have decisive force; to fulfill all righteousness, John must carry out the application of Jesus to be baptized, for he was sent to baptize all applicants. Jesus, to fulfill all righteousness, must undergo John's baptism of repentance in order to prove his humility and his solidarity with the people of God. The sequel shows that this proof of Jesus' righteousness was important. It becomes the occasion for his receiving the heavenly gift that made his ministry possible.

In the present text of Matthew, the story of Mk. 1:10 f. is slightly altered. Instead of Jesus' having a vision and hearing a voice as he came up out of the water, he here first comes out of the water onto dry land. Then the heavens were opened (in Mark, this was part of his vision) and Jesus saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove upon himself. The words uttered by the heavenly voice are not addressed to Jesus in the second person, as in Mark (though Codex D and the Old Syriac so give it), but are put in the third person: "This is my beloved son," etc. Jesus alone saw the Spirit, but the heavenly communication was for others.

4:1–11 The Temptation (Mk. 1:12–13; Lk. 4:1–13), Q. Matthew replaces Mark's brief account with a fuller one. If in Mark the Spirit drove Jesus out into the wilderness where he spent forty days being tempted by "the Satan" while being supplied with food by the angels, Matthew says he was *led up* into the wilderness (clearly the ascending wadis west of Jericho) by the Spirit in order to be tried by the Devil (Gr. *diábolos,* "adversary," translation of Aram. *sāṭānā*). *After* fasting forty days (cf. Ex. 34:28; 1 Kings 19:8) he was (exceedingly) hungry and therefore particularly vulnerable to any blandishment based on food. In this situation, the tempter drew near to him (as one person to another) and suggested a line of action appropriate for one who really is the Son of God: to change stones into bread (manifestly no harder than to change water into wine, Jn. 2:1 ff.). But to do so would be to put the divine Sonship to proof and follow the Devil's cue. Jesus rejects this temptation, quoting Deut. 8:3; he will wait until God feeds him, as he fed Israel with manna.

The Devil now takes Jesus along with him (cf. Ezek. 11:1) to the Holy City (a phrase already appearing in the Old Testament, cf. Is. 48:2, etc., but in the New Testament only in Matthew and Revelation). The reason for this transfer may perhaps be sought in a Jewish expectation, expressed in the apocryphal 2 Esd. 13:31, that the Messiah would stand on the top of Mt. Zion. The Devil sets him on "the wing" (cf. Dan. 9:27) of the sanctuary. Some think the word used for sanctuary (Gr. *hierón*) excludes "the House" and would localize the event at the gate leading into the Court of the Israelites (cf. Ezek. 11:1), which was about thirty feet high. But if this is a Semitic type of expression "wing" is more indicative of a horizontal point, such as an extremity (cf. of a garment, 1 Sam. 24:5; of the earth, Is. 24:16). In the fourth century the "wing" was interpreted as the southeast corner of the outer court, which hung over the Kidron Valley. Josephus describes the steep drop at this point as a terrifying one (*Ant., 15,* 11, 5). The Devil bids Jesus, if he be the Son of God, to cast himself down (to impress spectators? cf. the flight of Simon Magus at Rome in the apocryphal Acts of Peter) in bold reliance on God's assurance of Ps. 91:11 (interpreted as spoken for the benefit of the Messiah). Jesus parries this with another Scripture quotation forbidding a man to put God to the test (Deut. 6:16).

Then the Devil takes Jesus to a very high mountain from which one can see all the kingdoms of the world and their glory —clearly, then, a mythical mountain, and presuming vision beyond the capacity of the human eye. But it is the lure of the glory of civilization as well as possession of its totality that constitute the temptation. Universal empire, such as even Rome's Tiberius did not enjoy (for the Parthians ruled the East from the Euphrates to India), the Devil offers to Jesus if Jesus will but prostrate himself before the Devil and acknowledge him as Lord. This is the supreme onslaught—the attempt to lead him to forsake the God who has declared him his Son. (Matthew's realization of this led him to change the Q order of the temptations, which is preserved by Luke.) After such an obnoxious suggestion, Jesus terminates the temptation with a brusque dismissal of the tempter, quoting God's command of Deut. 6:13. The Devil then leaves him, and the angels draw near (in homage) and minister to him (with food, cf. Mk. 1:13; Acts 6:2).

Thus unshaken, after being tempted to self-help in privation, to recklessness in pseudo faith, yea to losing his soul in order to win the world (16:26), Jesus proves himself the Son in whom God delights—the prophesied Messiah-servant of Is. 42:1, on whom God has put his Spirit and who will bring justice to the nations. These are not the ordinary temptations of men. They are the temptations of the Messiah. The sacred legend, which may have evolved from reflection on 16:23 and the desire for an account of how Jesus underwent an ordeal, like accounts of ordeals endured by Heracles and other famous men, sets forth in marvelous manner why Jesus carried on his Messianic ministry as he did, going surely, obediently, unshakably in God's appointed way.

4:12–17 Appearance of Jesus in Galilee (Mk. 1:14–15; Lk. 4:14–15). Matthew's rewording of Mark gives the impression that Jesus sought to escape from Herod's bailiwick by going to Galilee after John was "given over" (into his hands by God); but Herod ruled that region, too, so John's arrest can only have been construed as a signal by Jesus. Matthew adds that he then left Nazareth (some texts: Nazara; cf. on 2:19–23) and dwelt in Capernaum, "the seaside one," in the territory (once inhabited by the tribes) of Zebulun and Naphtali. (It could lie in only one, viz., Naphtali, but Matthew has his mind on the prophecy he is going to quote; Jesus' home town, however, lay in Zebulun.) Mark has not made it clear, as Matthew here does, that Jesus' coming to Capernaum was a case of change of residence (cf. 9:1). The question, Why did he go there? receives no answer, except that of Scripture fulfillment; Matthew quotes Is. 8:23; 9:1 (actually he cites only the geographical terms in 8:23, and goes on to establish a connection with 9:1). The great light (= the Messiah) was to be seen first by the land of Zebulun and Naphtali, "the way of the sea," Transjordan and "Galilee of the Gentiles." It seems likely that Matthew called Capernaum "the seaside one" with his eye on Isaiah's phrase, "the way of the sea," though it is not clear how the evangelist interpreted the latter (perhaps as a road from Tiberias to Damascus?). That the Messiah had to appear in the "Galilee of the Gentiles" must also have seemed particularly significant, both as apologetic against Jewish objections (cf.

Jn. 7:41, 52) and as prophecy of the receptivity of the Gentiles for Christianity. From that time on (of his settling in Capernaum), Jesus began to preach. (According to Mark, with whom Luke agrees, Jesus *came to Galilee preaching.*) Matthew gives his message as a reiteration of that of the Baptist (3:2). He thus leaves out what was said in Mark about the fullness of time and the invitation to believe in the gospel (Mk. 1:14).

4:18–22 The Call of the First Disciples (Mk. 1:16–20; cf. Lk. 5:11). In Mark, Jesus walks along the shore of the lake, calls the disciples, and goes with them to Capernaum; it is his initial arrival at that place. Matthew has already brought him to Capernaum in 4:12 before the walk by the lakeside. The other divergences from Mark are of a minor nature. In mentioning Simon, Matthew adds "the one called Peter." This does not mean that he was known as Peter at the time of these events, but rather that he was better known by that name in Matthew's own day. The allusion to the hired men of Zebedee is left out.

4:23–25 Itinerant Preaching in Galilee (Mk. 1:39; Lk. 4:44; cf. Mk. 3:7–8). Matthew has omitted the happenings of Mk. 1:21–38, but is planning to use some of them later (8:14–17). He here goes on to Mk. 1:39, and largely in his own words restates what is said there: Jesus went about in all Galilee teaching in their (i.e., the Jews') synagogues *and* (as though this were a separate thing) proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom as well as healing all disease and weakness among the people (Mk. only: casting out demons). Matthew here adds that the report about Jesus went "into all Syria"—perhaps an indication of his special interest in this area (cf. the Introduction), with the consequence that they brought to him those suffering from various diseases and tortures, of whom three kinds are singled out: those possessed of demons, the moonstruck (cf. 17:15), and the paralytics. At this point, Matthew impinges on Mk. 3:7–8: great crowds followed Jesus from various regions. Mark's Idumaea is left out, as are Tyre and Sidon, but the Decapolis is added.

Having set up this preliminary background, Matthew in chs. 5–7 can introduce the Sermon on the Mount as illustrative of the aforementioned teaching and proclaiming of the gospel of the kingdom.

The Sermon on the Mount

5:1–7:28 (Lk. 6:20–49), Q

This so-called Sermon is the first of the lengthy discourses attributed to Jesus by this evangelist. It is not, however, a sermon in our sense of the word, but rather a collection of sayings of Jesus, editorially arranged. Comparison with Luke's Sermon on the Plain shows that both authors drew on the same source (Q), and that Matthew has expanded his version by building into it other Q sayings and by contributing to it some special material of his own. He evidently wanted to give a powerful and concentrated presentation of the teachings of Jesus at the beginning of his Messianic ministry.

The discourse is well organized. In the opening Beatitudes, Jesus hails those who are the true heirs of the kingdom—an indirect way of stating the conditions of admission. In the sayings on salt and light (5:13–16), the function of the disciples over against the world is set forth. Next, Jesus' attitude toward the Law of Moses is clarified (5:17–20), and then in a series of six antitheses Jesus gives a commentary on selected laws, in which he points out, by virtue of his prophetic authority, that more is required than mere fulfillment of the letter if one would obey the will of God (5:21–48). He then shows how good works lose all value and meaning unless they are performed in the right spirit (6:1–18), sets forth how one should not become entangled with the material things of this world but rather lead the simple, carefree life of the child of God (6:19–34). He next offers seven sayings on diverse topics (7:1–23), and closes with the parables of the builders (7:24–27).

It is hardly the purpose of Matthew to present Jesus as lawgiver. The Law had been given by Moses; it only needed to be interpreted properly. As already noted, a whole section of the Sermon shows how this should be done. But the Sermon contains much that is not just interpretation of the Law. It is a kind of manifesto. What he is doing is declaring the pure will of God, which those who would enter the kingdom should seek to fulfill. The Sermon is Matthew's substitute for Mark's fuller statement of the message of Jesus (cf. 4:17). But instead of putting repentance first, he dwells on the joyous aspect of the kingdom. His moral requirements are not regarded as making heavier the yoke which the Mosaic Law had imposed, but rather as a light burden (11:30).

5:1–2 Introduction (Lk. 6:20; cf. Mk. 3:13). "Seeing the crowds Jesus went up the mountain." Matthew has apparently skipped from Mk. 3:7–8 to 3:13 and found there a suitable setting for what he wants to present. Instead of relating the election of the Twelve—an event he omits entirely—he states that Jesus sat down (with the intention of teaching), and that his disciples drew near to listen. The disciples here are either the Twelve or the more immediate followers out of whom the Twelve, who are sent out in 10:1, were chosen. The teaching presented, however, is not just for the disciples, for in 7:28 the crowd reacts to it (cf. Lk. 7:1, according to which Jesus spoke his sayings into the ears of the people). The ascent to a height did not have the purpose of withdrawal to privacy, nor is it a counterpart to Moses' ascent of Mt. Sinai; rather, it is an impressive staging. The disciples are directly in front of him; the crowd is gathered behind them.

5:3–12 The Beatitudes (Lk. 6:20–23). Jesus starts with hailing those who are heirs of the kingdom. We have here a sheaf of eight (perhaps originally seven) third-person sayings, each beginning with "blessed," to which is added a ninth less succinct one in the second-person plural. This is an Oriental pattern familiar to Matthew's readers from the LXX translation of the Psalms. There "blessed" (Gr. *makários*) is the rendering of Heb. *ashrē,* literally meaning "O, the bliss of," hence "happy or fortunate is." It was used to hail a class of persons in some way considered enviable (cf. 1 Kings 10:8). Jesus' point of view, however, transcends the materialism of the Old Testament. He hails as blessed classes of people the Old Testament saints would not have envied. He puts a prediction after each exclamatory phrase, which, indeed, because of its paradoxical content, would be incomprehensible without such a counterbalancing element. In Luke's version, Jesus addresses those before him in the second-person plural. Matthew has given the sayings a broader application by putting them into the third person and even emphasizing the latter with the pronoun "they." Luke has only four Beatitudes. Matthew has increased the number; but Luke has contrasting "woes," which Matthew omits.

Jesus here hails the following groups:

1. The poor. To avoid misunderstanding, Matthew adds "in the spirit" (cf. the analogous phrase in Is. 66:2), for his Greek readers might not be aware that the word "poor" in the Old Testament often has a nuance lifting it above mere physical poverty (cf. Ps. 40:17, etc.). That Jesus puts this Beatitude first follows from "the poor" being mentioned first in Is. 61:1 (where A.V. renders the Hebrew word as "meek"; R.S.V.: "afflicted"; but LXX, the authoritative text for the New Testament writers, renders it as "poor"; cf. Lk. 4:18). Some hold that Jesus was thinking of the *'Am-hā-āreṣ* or "people of the land"—a Hebrew designation used in the Talmud for all those not striving to live up the Pharisaic rules and hence despised by the Pharisees; but that would seem to take in too many. It is more likely that Jesus is thinking of poor but pious people, whose miserable existence and remoteness from the Temple left them no time or opportunity to lead a life dedicated to religious observances. The kingdom of the earth is not theirs; that of God is (and will be) theirs. Similar contrasts underlie the other sayings.

2. The mourners. They shall be comforted; the thought may be of those "who mourn in Zion" (Is. 61:3) and the comfort envisioned, that of Lk. 2:25. Luke's divergent form of the saying (Lk. 6:21), however, is less "biblical" and more original and thinks of private sorrow.

3. The meek. They shall inherit the earth, an allusion to Ps. 37:11 where, however, "the land" and prosperity are the ob-

jectives, whereas here the thought is figurative of the kingdom of heaven. This saying, which is without an equivalent in Luke, is perhaps only a variant of the first, since the underlying word rendered "meek" (translated "gentle" in 1 Pet. 3:4), better "lowly," is practically identical with "poor."

4. They that hunger "and thirst for righteousness" (a phrase not found in Lk. 6:21) shall be satisfied (cf. Prov. 21:21). In the apocryphal book of Baruch 2:18 one finds a preview of such thoughts, but without the eschatological element.

5. The merciful—those practicing almsgiving, but also forgiving their debtors (cf. 18:33). They shall obtain mercy (i.e., at God's hands, for he is the merciful).

6. The pure in heart (Ps. 24:4, 73:1). They shall see God, thus obtaining what is promised the upright in Ps. 11:7. However, these Old Testament phrases received higher spiritualized meaning in the mouth of Jesus.

7. The peacemakers (i.e., those who are peacefully inclined and conciliatory). They shall be called (= be, 5:19) sons of God (in the sense of Lk. 20:36).

8. They that are (have been?) persecuted for the sake of righteousness (i.e., without just cause), for theirs is the kingdom (same promise as for the poor; the lack of imagination displayed in this repetition suggests that this Beatitude was formulated by Matthew). It is a generalized anticipation of the next one in v. 11, and was put here to provide a transition to it. It seems probable that Matthew intended to have only seven Beatitudes (cf. the seven parables of ch. 13 and the seven woes of ch. 23). The one most probably added later is the second (v. 4), the position of which varies in some manuscripts.

vv. 11–12 To this set of eight third-person Beatitudes is appended a second-person Beatitude for the persecuted disciples. This is parallel to the fourth of Luke's four Beatitudes (Lk. 6:22), and makes evident that Matthew has in the preceding ones made the change to the third person. Persecution is here made more vivid by mention of "reviling" and of "all manner of evil [falsely] spoken about them for Christ's sake." ("Falsely" is evidently an addition; cf. Codex D, Old Syriac and Old Latin, and Lk. 6:23.) They are to rejoice at such suffering (Jas. 1:2) in the thought that their pay (stored up) in the heavens is great (and will be brought to them when the kingdom comes to earth; cf. Rev. 22:12). In like manner, they (i.e., the Jewish people) persecuted the prophets who lived prior to the present time. (Cf. Heb. 11:33 ff.; Jas. 4:10–11. Since the Maccabean period pious Jews had drawn courage and comfort from stories of martyrdom, and legends had arisen about the prophets in which they were depicted as martyrs.) This ninth Beatitude and its attached invitation to rejoice reflect the persecution situation of the early Christians. The saying gives the living Christ's message to his followers. Matthew has set it apart from the preceding group because he has converted the preceding Beatitudes into a set of sayings describing the qualifications needed for entering the kingdom.

In this peculiarly Semitic form of expression, a song not of this world has been sung.

5:13–16 The Similes of Salt and Light (Lk. 14:34–35; 11:33). From the exalted level of the Beatitudes, with their thought of the kingdom of heaven, one descends to present reality—to the world in which Christians live and which it is their task to influence while waiting for that better world to come. What salt is to food they are to be to the earth (= mankind)—a seasoning, improving the taste (Job 6:6). The thought is similar to that of the parable of the leaven (13:33). It is the duty of the disciples to spread their beneficent influence. If like salt that loses its flavor they lose this power of penetration, what shall take its place (and of what use is their Christianity)? Such salt is fit only to be cast out and trodden under the foot of men (and such Christians are useless, too). The saying may be based on Mk. 9:50 (cf. there for "salt losing flavor").

They are to be the light of the world. A city set on a hill (like Sepphoris) cannot be hidden (a variant thought, though a connection can be established if one think of the city as radiant in the light of the rising or setting sun). People do not light a light to set it under a bushel measure where it cannot be seen, but rather to set it on a lampstand where it can give illumination to all those in the (one-room) house (cf. parallel Lk. 11:33). So they are to let their light shine before men that they may see their good works and praise their Father in heaven, who has wrought these works in and through them. The saying may have evolved out of Mk. 4:21. The saying about the city set on a hill is also given in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, *1*, 37, but fused with the thought of its having firm foundations and being unable to be brought low.

5:17–20 The Attitude of Jesus toward the Law. Matthew here presents the moral requirements for those who would enter the kingdom. What he offers in vv. 17–24 is his own special material. The hortatory address, "Do not think," is probably Hellenistic discussion style (cf. Jos., *Ant., 5,* 1, 26). In introducing this material here, Matthew is seeking to counteract the impression that one might easily get from 5:21 f. that Jesus was engaging in a polemic against the Law. He has not come to dissolve the Law or the Prophets (the two collections were put in separate scrolls), but rather to fulfill them. To dissolve is to "declare invalid or annul" (Aram. *baṭṭēl*); to fulfill is: to "confirm," "obey," "carry out" (Aram. *qayyēm*). He recognizes their authority, as is demonstrated by the fact that he appeals to them for proof or interprets what they say. From the point of view of rabbinic Judaism the allusion to the Prophets might well have been omitted here. But apparently Jesus and the Judaism of his time also valued the Prophets highly. These included the historical books from Joshua through 2 Kings, as well as those we think of as Prophets (cf. how Jesus utilized 1 Sam. 21:6 in 12:3 ff.).

vv. 18–19 The thought is carried further in two powerful sayings. The first is an Amen-saying about the perpetual duration and validity of the Law. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not one iota (smallest letter in the new-style alphabet; not mentioned in the parallel Lk. 16:17) or a projection of a letter ("tittle," Gr. *keraía*) shall pass away from the (written Law) until all things come about (i.e., until God's will is fully obeyed on earth; cf. 6:10). The second saying declares that whoever disregards one of the least of the Commandments and teaches others to do likewise shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven, whereas he who observes and teaches others to observe them shall be called great. Since both are "in the kingdom of heaven," the saying has reference to Christian teachers. Those frowned upon for laxity are not, however, read out of the Church. These sayings are difficult to reconcile with other words and actions of Jesus, and presumably have attained such a radical form through someone who was opposed to Antinomian tendencies in the Church.

v. 20 This verse, declaring that unless their righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees they will never enter into the kingdom of heaven, comes in rather abruptly. The concern of the preceding has been with the Old Testament Law, and what follows deals with the interpretation of that Law. Specifically Pharisaic teachings are not at issue here. But Matthew may have put the saying in this position to prepare the way for Jesus' scriptural interpretation. It concedes that the Pharisees have a righteousness, but maintains that it belongs to the old order. A better righteousness is needed for entry into the kingdom—the kind that Jesus is about to delineate. "Righteousness" is the ethical ideal for Matthew, as for the Pharisees.

5:21–26 On Homicide (Lk. 12:57–59). In this and the following sections we have the so-called six antitheses, all built on the pattern: "You have heard . . . but I say . . ." A contrast is made between what was said to the ancients (cf. the Talmudic phrase: "the former generations") and what Jesus says now. However, what was said to the ancients remains unshaken except in a single case. After what has just been said about Jesus and the Law of Moses—even allowing for some exaggeration—one can expect no departure from the Law, but only novel interpretation of it. Pharisees, too, were bent on thinking out the implications of the

Commandments. However, their approach remained on the level of casuistry. Jesus follows the new method of discerning the pure will of God from which a Commandment flows. The first example he gives deals with the sixth Commandment of the Decalogue: Thou shalt not kill (Ex. 20:13); whoever kills shall be liable to judgment (i.e., this constitutes a court case). Jesus makes this Commandment include anger toward one's "brother" (fellow man —not necessarily just Christian brother), the emotion out of which killing comes. That thought was not easy for a Jew to accept. The Pharisee Josephus, for example, declares that mere intention to do a wrong is not deserving of (divine) punishment (*Ant., 12,* 9, 1). Jesus thus unconsciously veers toward the ethics of principle as set forth by the Greek philosophers. Cutting off the esteem of one's brother, too, Jesus regards as forbidden by this Commandment. He quotes the abusive epithet "raca" (Gr. *rácha,* usually explained as a rather poor transcription of Aram. *rēqā,* "empty i.e., stupid one"). Still worse is calling the brother "fool" (Gr. *mōrós*), which removes a man from the class of those worth associating with. Jesus sees different degrees of punishment suitable for these offenses: in the first case, trial before the (local) court; in the second, before the supreme court ("council"); in the third case, the divine judgment of the "Gehenna of fire," i.e., the fiery hell (cf. Mk. 9:45–47). Never was it so vividly brought home to men what they do to each other, what crimes even the so-called righteous daily commit.

vv. 23–26 Several other sayings dealing with disturbed personal relations are then put here by Matthew. Offense given to one's brother (vv. 23–24) creates a situation where one cannot honestly worship. For worship is a congregational act, even under the pre-Christian conception of the sacrificial cult. In vivid terms, therefore, Jesus bids the individual first to become reconciled with his brother before sacrificing. The saying evidently attained this form in Jerusalem, while the cult was still operative. Mk. 11:25 has it in more original form. The second saying (vv. 25–26) concerns readiness to reach an accommodation with the person who has a just grievance against one. This saying, which Lk. 12:58–59 puts in a different connection and applies very differently, is used by Matthew to teach that it is the part of wisdom to reach a settlement with one's brother before approaching the final stage of the trial, with its threatening consequence: the debtor's prison, from which there is no getting out except by payment of the debt in full.

5:27–30 On Adultery. In the next illustration of the new righteousness, Jesus considers the Commandment against adultery (Ex. 21:14), which he takes as also ruling out desire directed toward a (married) woman. The interpretation here is not as detailed as in the previous Commandment; the earlier instance has sufficiently demonstrated his approach. If it is followed through, the (married) woman's desire for another man must receive like condemnation, and fornication or even desire to commit it are to be condemned. Instead of such elaboration, however, Matthew in 5:29–30 adduces the sayings about plucking out the eye, and cutting off the right hand, to make vivid the radical way in which the individual is to fight temptation in this entire sphere (cf. 18:8–9 and Mk. 9:43–48).

5:31–32 On Divorce. A saying about divorce is appended here. He who divorces his wife except in the case of adultery makes her commit adultery (through her wedding another), and he who weds such an improperly dismissed wife is guilty of adultery. (Cf. 19:9 and Lk. 16:18 for variants.) The formulation in Mk. 10:11–12 is more natural.

5:33–37 On Oaths. The third illustration, Matthew's special material, is not derived from a Commandment of the Decalogue, but gives the substance (cf. the procedure of 2:23) of Old Testament sayings concerning perjury (Lev. 19:12) and fulfillment of vows (Num. 30:3; Deut. 23:21). Jesus says his disciples should not swear at all, and goes to considerable length to condemn the modified type of swearing in which one invokes some substitute for the name of God such as heaven, earth or Jerusalem (with quotation from Ps. 48:2), or swears by one's own head. (In rabbinic texts, oaths by heaven or earth are considered invalid, oaths by Jerusalem do not occur; the oath by one's head has the form "by the life of my head." In the Damascus document which originally came from the Dead Sea Scrolls community, the oath by the deity is forbidden—one is to swear only by the curses of the Covenant, Lev. 26:14 ff.) Man should not swear by that over which he has no power. The double affirmative or double negative mentioned in v. 37 is found also in some rabbinic passages and has intensifying force. (Or was the directive of Jesus originally the one found in James 5:12: let your "yes" be "yes," etc.?) The final remark declares everything going beyond this as "from the evil," i.e., a consequence of the evil (cf. v. 39) existing in the world, less probably "from the Evil One" (cf. 13:19).

5:38–42 On Retaliation (Lk. 6:29–30). As a fourth example, Jesus takes the famous retaliation principle (Ex. 21:23 f.; Lev. 24:19 f.), which, however, was a dead letter in his time and is used figuratively. He commands nonresistance to the wicked person (cf. 1 Cor. 4:12), and gives three instances of the kind of wicked action to which the disciples were apt to be exposed at the hands of their neighbors: the insulting blow (cf. Lam. 3:30), confiscatory court action, compulsory service (Mk. 15:21). Readiness to suffer even greater insult (the blow on the right cheek—but cf. Lk. 6:29—was more insulting than that on the left), giving voluntarily more than is confiscated (Lk. 6:29 puts the undergarment last), doing double of what is imposed (e.g., by a soldier, Lk. 3:14), are directed by Jesus, though without further justification such as is given in v. 45. To give to the one that begs and not to turn away from him that would borrow was a restatement of the Old Testament position (Deut. 15:7–11); mention of this point suggests that there was much poverty in Matthew's Christian community. In the face of the oncoming kingdom, insistence on one's rights, resistance leading to embittered relations, hardness of heart toward the needy, were to be avoided.

5:43–48 On Love of One's Enemies (Lk. 6:27–28, 32–36). Jesus now takes up still another ancient saying: One is to love one's neighbor (Deut. 19:18) and hate one's enemy. The second half of this directive was not an Old Testament commandment, but perhaps had been joined to the first in proverbial use. (In Lk. 6:27–28, the Old Testament is not quoted.) Jesus commands love of the enemy, intercession in prayer for the persecutor that one may become a "son of God" in the moral sense. The enemy meant is hardly the national foe, though Jesus would not be apt to have excluded him, but rather the personal one. Matthew's readers, as Jewish Christians living in a hostile environment, naturally had many such. The better righteousness requires love of even these persecutors, after God's example. For just to love those that love us or to give the greeting of peace to our brethren only does not transcend the level of publican and pagan. Jesus bids his hearers be perfect (19:21), as God is perfect. This saying is modeled on Lev. 11:44; 19:2. But Lk. 6:36 has "merciful" instead of "perfect," and that sounds more original.

6:1–4 On Almsgiving. The Old Testament Law imposed obligatory observance of sacrifice, feasts, sabbaths, tithes, and ritualistic rules, but there was a part of the religious life which was left to the individual. According to Pharisaic teachings, special efforts here were believed to earn merits in heaven. The three most important good works were almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. To such things the Sermon now turns. Jesus sees an impure motive governing men in these activities. He thus applies the standard of the higher righteousness to them.

Charitable giving was so important in this period that the Hebrew word for "righteousness" acquired the meaning of "almsgiving." If we can regard later Jewish custom as already prevailing then, contributions were asked of the people in synagogues or at public fast-services held in the streets. Men who made great sacrifices were given places of honor in the synagogues. Jesus satirizes the vanity of those seeking public admiration for their generosity. Whether the trumpet was actually blown to proclaim some great donation is not known (it was blown, e.g., to indicate the approach of the Sabbath, or for someone's decease); it here may be only a vivid figure of speech. In Jesus' view, the satisfaction gained from public acclaim cancels all heavenly merit. The almsgiving which God rewards is secret.

6:5–8 On Prayer. Prose prayer, as distinct from older rhythmic prayer, had become customary in Judaism; to recite such a prayer at certain hours was a mark of Pharisaic piety. Two prayers were customary in Jesus' time—one in the morning about 9:00 o'clock and one in the afternoon about 3:00 o'clock. It was permissible to pray wherever one might be, on the street or in the field or at home, though there was added value in going to the synagogue. The *Shemoneh-esreh,* or "eighteen (petitions)," the prayer par excellence, took final shape by the end of the first century, and no doubt parts of it are older still. Standing prayer is presupposed in v. 5 as the usual custom. Jesus satirizes ostentatious prayer and denies it any merit before God. (This shows that observance of prayer seasons was the exception, and not yet the rule as it was for Talmudic Judaism; for where all pray it no longer attracts any attention.) Meritorious prayer, Jesus declares, is wholly private—the storeroom (which can be locked) is mentioned as the most secret place for offering it. To this is added a warning against "empty speech," which characterized the prayer of the heathen, and the verbosity by which they thought to make an answer the more sure. Jesus discourages his followers from imitating them (as some Jews were evidently doing), for God's omniscience is aware of his children's needs before they ask.

6:9–13 (+ 14–15) The Lord's Prayer (Lk. 11:2–4). At this point is included, editorially, a model prayer, which Luke does not have in ch. 6, but rather in ch. 11 where he gives the occasion for it. Luke's form of it is shorter and there are textual differences. One cannot suppose that Luke would have left anything out in a matter so important. It stands to reason that he has it in the form in which early missionaries like Paul carried it to the Gentiles. Matthew's must be a later, more developed Eastern ecclesiastical form. What is true of the formulae of the Last Supper—that they were expanded in the interest of clarity and greater impressiveness—is true here, too. Some of this expansion may already have taken place prior to translation into Greek. Thus the address of Luke, "Father," is lengthened in Matthew to: "Our Father who art in the heavens"—phraseology occurring in Hebrew prayers. It is possible that "hallowed be thy name," which directly follows "Father" in Luke, was not originally a petition, but was an introductory praise. The first real petition would then appropriately have been the one for the coming of God's kingdom, for that was the keynote of the message of the historical Jesus (Mk. 1:15). However, in Matthew's ecclesiastical form of the prayer, "hallowed be thy name" may already have been understood as a petition, and as such it has a parallel in an old Jewish prayer, the *Qaddīsh* which begins with: "May be glorified and hallowed his great Name in the world which he created according to his will." Originally the name of God meant Yahweh, for which "the Lord" was regularly substituted by the Jews. In that meaning such a petition would have had little significance for Christians. It must therefore have been understood in a sense basically parallel to that for the kingdom. The latter petition in turn was affected by proximity to this one, and no longer has the apocalyptic significance, but means the sovereignty of God in man.

"Thy will be done, etc.," is missing in Luke and is in all probability derived from the Gethsemane prayer of Jesus (26:42), but is here understood more broadly in the sense of the advancement of God's cause on earth and man's participation in it.

The petition for bread is an original element, but contains a philological and a textual uncertainty. The word rendered "daily" (Gr. *epioúsios*) was not known even to the great third-century biblical scholar Origen. It has finally turned up in a papyrus, but without shedding any significant light on its meaning. Jerome reports that the Aramaic *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (which was probably translated from the Greek) rendered "until tomorrow" here. Eastern Christians may thus have understood the Greek word as identical with Gr. *epoúsios,* which Josephus uses in the meaning "what is intended for the coming day" (he says "*epitḗdeios*" for "what is intended for today"). The word "this day" (Gr. *sḗmeron*) is not used in Luke, who has "according to the day," thus asking more than Matthew's form does, and so perhaps less original in this particular.

The petition for forgiveness of debts is also basic. The underlying Semitic (*ḥūbā*) meant both "debt" and "sin" (hence Luke says "sins"), to which is added the thought "as we forgive our debtors" (Lk.: "everyone owing us"), which elicits the elaboration below in v. 14. The source of the petition may be Mk. 11:25–26.

The petition that God may not lead us into temptation applied originally to tests of one's fortitude in trials (cf. 1 Pet. 4:12). It is the hope of the individual that he be spared such situations, to which his strength may not be equal. Matthew's text gives a seventh petition, which Luke does not have: "deliver us from (the) evil." The term "(the) evil" is hardly to be translated "the Evil One" (13:19), but is to be understood as the evil and wickedness of the world (5:37). The addition of this petition had an effect on the way in which one read the sixth; "temptation" was thereby shifted away from trials of suffering in the direction of temptation to do the evil thing.

The familiar doxology is not found in the best manuscripts and is missing in Luke. It must, however, be old, as similar phraseology appears in Jewish prayers. It was an excellent addition, in view of the transition of Christianity from an apocalyptic movement to a religion adapting itself to continued life in this world; for over against the things from which deliverance is asked, this conclusion sets the upper world of the Divine, possessing the kingdom, the power and the glory forever and ever (lit., unto the aeons; cf. Rom. 11:36). The "amen" at the end was originally an expression of endorsement, uttered by those hearing another pray; it was not used in the Temple.

vv. 14–15 A saying on forgiving and not forgiving follows the Lord's Prayer. It could be a residue of some further general instruction about prayer (cf. vv. 5–8), which was replaced by the Lord's Prayer. In effect it now is a commentary on just one petition (v. 12). An alternate possibility that the prayer originally ended with v. 12 is less likely in view of Luke's having a further petition.

6:16–18 On Fasting. Here again Jesus finds the peril of ostentation. The customs in fasting were akin to those of mourning. Jesus directs his disciples not to give themselves sorrowful countenances after the manner of the hypocrites, who make their faces unsightly (by not washing themselves, leaving the beard unkempt, strewing ashes on their head) to advertise to men that they are fasting. The admiration for their piety they thus acquire is all the reward they can expect. For a reward from heaven one must conceal the good work from the eyes of men—therefore, wash the face, anoint the head (and wear a glad countenance).

6:19–21 On Treasures (Lk. 12:33–34; 16:13)

vv. 19–21 Jesus decries laying up "treasures" (Lk. sing.). In the simple conditions of life which he confronted, "treasure" seems to have consisted in part of woolen or linen garments or goods, which were subject to being eaten by moths. Whether Gr. *brṓsis* refers to damage to cloth by some other agent (cf. our "silverfish") or means "rust" and applies to metal objects here is not clear; in Jas. 5:3 gold and silver are referred to (erroneously) as rusting, but with an unmistakable word. (Naturally Jesus would wish metals included in his general thought, but the people he was concerned with had little money; cf. Lk. 15:8.) That such goods were the object of thievery, too, is presupposed; the thieves "dig through" (the word suggests an underground tunnel; cf. its use in Jos., *Vita, 31*) in order to get into the house. Possessions deflect the attention from God on whom it should be centered. Matthew has considerably broadened the original Q material here, as comparison with Luke shows; there almsgiving lays up treasure in heaven.

6:22–23 Parable of the Eye (Lk. 11: 34–36). There follows a parabolic saying dealing with the eye, which Luke uses in another connection. Matthew apparently is interpreting it to mean that being embroiled with materialistic matters has an injurious effect on spiritual insight. The saying declares that the eye is the lamp of the body; if it be healthy the whole body is light (= has light around it), while if it be bad (= diseased) the body is full of darkness (= has darkness around it). If then the light *in you* (= the inner eye, or the spirit) is (submerged) in darkness, how great will be the darkness (of the spirit). That the spirit or soul of man is a lamp in him is also stressed in rabbinic texts on the basis of Prov. 20:27.

6:24 On Serving Two Masters (Lk. 16:13). Continuing the thought of v. 21, Jesus gives the celebrated saying on the impossibility of serving two masters. Mammon (Gr. *mamōnás*) is an Aramaic word for one's possessions. It is found also in rabbinic sources.

6:25–34 On Cares (Lk. 12:22–31). But the same principle also applies to anxiety about life (lit., the soul), namely, with respect to food and drink, and about the body with respect to clothing. The rhetorical question, whether life and the body are not more than these things, again implies that God who gave the greater will also attend to the lesser. The birds are used as an example of his providence in the matter of food, and their value in his eyes contrasted with that of men.

In the saying of v. 27, Who can add one cubit to his length when anxious to do so? the anxiety is not quite of the same serious nature as in what precedes and follows. Indeed, the word seems to be used satirically. Some interpreters think this means adding a cubit, figuratively speaking, to one's length of life. But this is artificial; the same word "length" is used for stature in the case of Zacchaeus (Lk. 19:3), and Luke in his parallel adds a moral which would not fit the "span of life" idea at all: "If then you are not able to do so small a thing as that" (Lk. 12:26). The saying may have been put here merely because it used the word "anxious."

The anxiety theme is properly continued in v. 28 with respect to raiment. Jesus calls attention to the growth of the lilies (Gr. *krína;* cf. Song 4:5, LXX, probably the *anemone coronaria*), which without effort receive a "purple" (red) cloak outshining Solomon's (a legendary touch, stimulated no doubt by 2 Chron. 9:4, which calls attention to the gorgeous clothing of that ruler's servants). God who thus clothes the grass (among which field flowers after blooming are reckoned), which when dry is used to heat the oven, will certainly clothe his children. Jesus ends the statement by addressing his listener as "ye of little faith" (lit., "short with respect to faith"—not thinking of its lack of intensity, but rather of its inability to persist when difficulties arise). He urges them to desist from anxious forethought about sustenance, considering that to be typical of the Gentiles who know no merciful Father in heaven. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you." (The exact form of this saying is uncertain; the Old Syriac supports it, but Codex S has "Seek ye first the kingdom of his righteousness," while Codex B has "Seek ye first righteousness and his kingdom." The parallel in Lk. 12:31 has only "Instead, seek his kingdom." Perhaps Matthew originally wrote "Seek ye first the kingdom and righteousness.")

7:1–5 On Judging (Lk. 6:37–38, 41–42). In the congregational life, each member observes the other; the tendency to place an evil interpretation on actions or words of others is strong, and leads to "judging" (in the evil sense of "condemning"). To be a self-appointed judge and deliver verdicts is not the way to find mercy in the judgment of God, who will surely apply to the self-righteous the same yardstick that they employed. Jesus uses the figure of the mote and "beam" in the eye (which is also found in a saying of a rabbi of A.D. 100) to dissuade from false zeal in correcting others.

7:6 On Casting Pearls. "Do not give the holy to the dogs, do not cast your pearls before swine." Though striking and intriguing, this is an extremely obscure saying.

Its placement here is purely editorial, as the connection gives no clue to its meaning. In the Didache (9:5), a work dating from the middle of the second century, the first half of this directive is used to show that those who were not baptized should be excluded from the Eucharist. In the pre-Christian situation, it may have meant to beware of profanation of that which had been hallowed. According to Semitic parallelism, the second half must mean approximately the same thing as the first half. The "dogs" are hardly to be understood literally, since the swine cannot be meant literally. Comparison of the Gentiles to dogs appears in 15:26, and that may also be the case here. The mention of casting "pearls" before swine is peculiar, and the possibility that the underlying Aramaic was corrupted cannot be ruled out. However, rabbinic texts use the word "pearl" for an apt or clever saying. If "swine" here likewise means Gentiles, then the advice is: "Do not communicate the mysteries of the kingdom (13:10) to them; it will only result in their being desecrated and in your being subjected to personal abuse."

7:7–11 On Answer to Prayer (Lk. 11:9–13). Jesus encourages the prayer of petition, particularly for urgent material needs. He uses as illustration a father's reaction to his son's request for a loaf or a fish (Lk.: a fish or an egg); such a one surely would not answer by giving his son a stone or a serpent (Lk.: a serpent or a scorpion). How much greater, then, is the love and generosity of the heavenly Father. Luke has this after the parable of the Friend at Midnight.

7:12 The Golden Rule (Lk. 6:31). This familiar saying is given in the positive form. The negative form was more common in antiquity (cf. Tob. 4:15). To this popular moral counsel, which is not really in line with the more radical ethic of Jesus (cf. 5:46), is added the specifically Jewish thought that "this is the Law and the Prophets." Perhaps Jewish tradition has been appropriated here, for Rabbi Hillel (20 B.C.) gives the rule in its negative form and then adds, "This is the whole Law, and everything else is elucidation." Law and Prophets are two main divisions of the Hebrew Old Testament Canon and are joined together for that reason. The third division was still incomplete (cf. Lk. 24:44).

7:13–14 The Narrow Gate (Lk. 13:23–24). Jesus urges entering through the narrow gate to (eternal) life. The way to it is a constricted one, and only few find it. By contrast, he speaks of the wide gate and the broad way leading to "the (eternal) destruction," and says that many enter through it. The saying is put here editorially by Matthew, as the Lucan parallel shows. Matthew has extended the comparison and made it more impressive. The idea of the two ways (cf. Jer. 21:8) was a popular one in ancient ethical instruction. The second-century Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, chs. 1–6, contains a detailed example of it.

7:15–20 The Test of Goodness (Lk. 6:43–44). Jesus warns against the false prophets who come in sheep's clothing, but within are ravenous wolves (cf. Gen. 49:27). In 24:23 f., false prophets are among the signs preceding the Second Coming. No doubt the Church of Matthew's time and environment was having its troubles with prophets. How was one to know whether a prophet was false or true? The saying "By their fruits ye shall know them" is put here to provide a criterion, but originally had a broader significance, as Luke's parallel, which was not directed at prophets, shows. Matthew has elaborated on his source and introduced the thought of what happens to the tree that does not bring good fruit (cf. 3:10).

7:21–23 Warning against Self-Deception (Lk. 6:46; 13:26–27). Not all who address Jesus as "Lord, Lord" (Gr. *kýrios,* reduplicated for emphasis) will enter the kingdom, but only those who do the will of his Father in heaven. This declaration, as Luke's parallel shows, hangs together with the concluding parables. But before giving these, Matthew interjects another saying, which also contained the phrase "Lord, Lord." It describes how Jesus (in the final judgment) will disavow even those who prophesied, cast out demons, and did many miracles (Gr. *dýnamis,* a manifestation of power) in (= through) his name (i.e., as Christians), dismissing them with the words of Ps. 6:8a, LXX, "Depart from me, ye that work lawlessness" (Gr. *anomía*). Cf. 13:41.

7:24–27 Concluding Parables (Lk. 6:47–49). Jesus compares him who hears his words and does them to the wise man who builds his house on the rock. He then gives a vivid description of the test provided by a Palestinian storm; how the rain—which can assume the character of a cloudburst—descends and how "rivers" of water come (down every gully, some inevitably heading for that building) and how winds fall upon it. But it does not collapse because it is founded on the rock. The one who hears but does not do his words is then compared to the man who builds his house on sand. In the same circumstances, the house collapses—the winds striking it give the final blow—"and great is its fall." Houses built on sand were to be found only along the coast. (Cf. the fact that twenty houses were destroyed at *el 'Arīsh* in a single storm in November, 1926.) Stories of such happenings were brought inland by merchants and travelers—the more readily because there was a considerable Jewish population in the coastal region since Maccabean times. (A Jewish teacher of A.D. 120 gives two somewhat similar parables, which suit the inland situation; the contrast is between a house having a foundation made of stones and one in which (sun-dried) brick was used; the latter structure was quickly undermined, and fell when the rains came.)

By presenting the main directives of Jesus in this concentrated form, Matthew indeed gave his readers the opportunity to build a structure of life that could withstand all storms.

7:28–29 The Effect of the Sermon (Lk. 7:1a). Matthew provides a sectional conclusion by referring to Jesus' "finishing these words." He notes, too, that "the crowds" were amazed at his teaching, and adds here the comment which Mk. 1:22 had given at the less prominent occasion of the synagogue service at Capernaum (omitted by Matthew).

When Jesus taught his disciples and the crowds in Galilee, he impressed his hearers as being a prophet sent to proclaim a coming new order of things, in which the will of God would be done. He indicated lines of conduct—without any effort to give a complete picture—for those who would enter this kingdom. But for the Christian community for which Matthew wrote, Jesus was the risen Lord, who would return as Son of man and reign as Messiah. His teachings were not assembled as a matter of historical record, but to provide guidance for the Christian life. The delay in the return of Jesus had already forced an increasing adaptation on the part of Christians to existence in the world. The radicalism of sayings, originally spoken in the belief that the kingdom was imminent, was toned down here and there. Even so, they remained strict enough to require much of the Christian believer. The Dead Sea Scroll labeled by its editors "Manual of Discipline," but more recently called "The Rule of the Community" or simply "The Rule" (Dupont-Sommer), has given us a contemporary yardstick with which to measure the Sermon on the Mount. Here, also, high moral requirements are set up, notably in the initial "Commitment," but to these are added ordinances and a penal code to govern the life of an isolated and independent community. Jewish-Christian congregations had no such complete independence, and hence no laws and penal code. It would be strange, however, if they required anything less in the way of moral standards from their membership than did the Essenes. That these directives of the Sermon on the Mount were meant to be followed was still taken for granted in such second-century writings as the *Apology* of Justin Martyr and the *Didache*, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Indeed, the latter work corresponds closely in pattern and substance to the Sermon.

We cannot here follow through the history of Christian reaction to the Sermon on the Mount. One thing is certain: It is among the most important portions of the New Testament, and none who would serve God in the spirit of Christ can pass it by. It leads men into the secret places of the Most High, and stirs the conscience as no comparable piece of speaking or writing has ever done. In the noble words of a pioneer of New Testament form criticism, "The radicalism of the Sermon on the Mount is our judgment, its announcement of another world is our hope (Dibelius)."

8:1–4 The Healing of a Leper (Mk. 1:40–45; Lk. 5:12–16). Having given a presentation of the message of Jesus, Matthew proceeds to illustrate Jesus' mighty works. To this end, Matthew relates miracle stories in swift succession in 8:1–9:34. The section, however, is not confined strictly to such stories (cf. 8:18–22; 9:9–17).

On descending from the mountain (and proceeding further), Jesus is followed by the crowd of 4:25. But this is only a transitional verse fashioned by Matthew. In vv. 2 f., Matthew rejoins Mark (1:40) and relates the healing of the leper, which that author had made an incident of the preaching tour in Galilee. Matthew omits the leper's "beseeching" and for his "kneeling" substitutes that he prostrated himself. The man addresses Jesus with a pious "Lord," but as in Mark expresses his belief that Jesus can cleanse him if he wants to. That Jesus was filled with sympathy is deleted. The saying of Jesus, "I will. Be cleansed," is followed by immediate cleansing. (In Mark, this does not seem to be the case.) That Jesus spoke sharply to the leper and immediately sent him away is also omitted. The parting words of Jesus to the man are given with a minor correction: instead of saying that he should offer for his cleansing "what things Moses had commanded," he is told to offer the *gift* which Moses had commanded. (Perhaps Matthew has his eye on what Jewish Christians should do, now that the Temple cult has ceased.) The man's spreading of the news and the consequent gathering of crowds (Mk. 1:45), forcing Jesus to go into desert places, are left out. The effect obtained by such editing is to concentrate the attention on the dialogue between the leper and Jesus—the real substance of the incident in which there is lasting value and interest. All colorful story elements and anything human in Jesus' emotions or actions have been sacrificed.

8:5–13 The Centurion of Capernaum (Lk. 7:1–10; 13:28–30; 7:10 Q; cf. Jn. 4:46–54). Matthew unlike Luke, first puts the healing of the leper from Mk. 1:40–45 after the Sermon, but then switches to this Q story. The return to Capernaum is not reported narratively as in Luke, but is merely alluded to in the initial clause. Details of the original story, which Luke preserves, are altered; others are left out. For the sick man, Luke uses the word slave, whereas Matthew uses a word that can mean either "servant" or "child" (cf. Jn. 4:46); he means the former here. That the servant was dear to the centurion is omitted, and his being at the point of death is changed to paralysis and suffering pain. The centurion does not send elders of the Jews to Jesus, but comes to him in person. The testimonial given about him in Lk. 8:4–5 can thus be cut out, along with the messenger scene of Lk. 8:6. The salient part of the story however—the utterance of the centurion and the reaction of Jesus—is preserved. Lk. 7:7 had to be dropped in view of the man's coming in person. That Jesus turned and spoke to the crowd is altered to his speaking to those that "followed him" (in the sense of disciples). To make the conclusion more impressive, a further Q saying is used in vv. 11–12 (= Lk. 13:28–30). It is worked in by means of rearrangement and deletions. That "the sons of the kingdom will go forth into the outermost darkness" is an elaboration. The conclusion of the narrative (Lk. 7:10) had to be changed in view of the direct meeting of the principal persons. Jesus dismissed the centurion with, "Go, as thou didst believe, so may it be to thee." "In that hour" (translation of a Semitic phrase) the servant was healed. Matthew has enhanced the value of the story for the Christian reader by underlining the centurion's faith.

8:14–15 The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law (Mk. 1:29–31; Lk. 4:38–39). Jesus now comes into the town proper and to the house of Peter. This incident, which Mark had put after Jesus' first arrival in Capernaum, could be conveniently placed here where another coming to that town was mentioned. But whereas in Mark, Jesus is told about the mother-in-law's sickness, he here sees her prostrate and feverish. For his taking hold of her hand and raising her up Matthew substitutes a mere touching of her hand. The healed woman arises and ministers to *him* (not to *them*).

8:16–17 Healings at Eventide (Mk. 1:32–34; Lk. 4:40–41). As in Mark, this follows the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, but with the narration slightly abridged. Matthew has Jesus cast out the spirits *with a word* (cf. v. 8), without employing other exorcism procedures, and heal *all* the sick (Mk.: many). That he would not permit the demons to speak is dropped. Instead, Matthew sees here the fulfillment of Is. 53:4, but the verse is not quoted in the form found in the LXX. Matthew evidently interpreted "he took" and "he bore" the diseases in the sense of "carrying them away." Messianic interpretation of Is. 53 appears first in the Similitudes of the pseudepigraphic Book of Enoch which probably originated in the first quarter of the first century A.D. in a group like the Qumran sect. (The Similitudes, however, are missing at Qumran and may be Christian.) The collective interpretation of the Servant of Yahweh is attested to by Origen (*Against Celsus, 1,* 55).

8:18–22 Diverse Followers (Lk. 9:57–60), Q. Seeing great crowds about him, Jesus commanded a departure for the other shore. This opening statement is parallel to Mk. 4:35, but before continuing with his version of Mark's story of the lake crossing, Matthew interjects two brief items, consisting of sayings of Jesus with brief situation-descriptions. A scribe addressing Jesus as "teacher," offers to follow him wherever he goes. Presumably Matthew has put this here with an eye to the impending boat trip and its perils. Jesus replies by describing his present migratory life in discouraging terms: foxes (jackels) have burrows, birds have nests, but the Son of man has not where he may lay his head. The saying would fit better in the situation after Jesus finally left Capernaum. It served to make the man think twice before becoming, like the Twelve, a full-fledged follower of Jesus. That he is considered a disciple in the broader sense is shown by the introduction to the next incident: "Another of the disciples said to him." This second individual, too, has not thus far been a steady companion of Jesus. He addresses Jesus as "Lord" and craves leave to go first and bury his father (whose death must just have been reported to him). This fits poorly in the situation before the lake crossing, since that could not be deferred for a funeral. The underlying thing is the thought of going with Jesus. The Lord commands the disciple to follow him and let the dead bury their dead. (Rabbinic parallels show that the ungodly can be called "dead," but that thought does not fit well here; Jesus may have meant: let the dead attend to their own kind. They will, of course, do nothing and so this is tantamount to disregarding pious custom.) The saying was harsh to Jewish ears, for the Commandment to honor one's father and mother covered the obligation of providing decent burial and was held important. Jesus here demands an almost military discipline of his real followers. The kingdom of God must come first (10:37). This was spoken in the spirit of Elisha (1 Kings 19:19–21). It is the heroic attitude for a time when every energy must be bent to a single purpose. It is not meant to encourage lack of attention to family obligations in normal times and situations.

8:23–27 The Calming of the Tempest (Mk. 4:35–41; Lk. 8:22–25). The lake crossing comes next. Rather significantly Jesus enters the boat first and his disciples (unlike the persons of 8:18–22) "follow." The storm on the sea is then related, but with omission of some of the more colorful details in Mark. The windstorm is changed to a great "earthquake" (Gr. *seismós*) in the sea, but that this is a revision by Matthew, perhaps under the influence of experience of seismic phenomena, appears from the allusion to the wind in v. 26. The question of the disciples in Mk. 4:38 is turned into a prayer: "Lord, save, we are perishing." Instead of asking whether they have any faith, Jesus calls them men of little faith. The words spoken to the elements are omitted. The allusion to a great fear of the disciples is changed to mere wondering. What *they* said in Mark's version is turned into a saying of men in general—presumably as a later reaction, when the incident became known. Instead of "wind," Matthew has "winds" to emphasize that all four winds obey Jesus, not just the one that blew on this occasion. With such small changes, the whole tone of the story is altered in a direction more pleasing to faith. The Lord who is with them always has power to save in any crisis.

8:28–34 The Gadarene Demoniacs (Mk. 5:1–20; Lk. 8:26–39). Mark's "Gerasene" demoniac is doubled in Matthew. The country here is called land of the Gadarenes in the best manuscripts (A.V.: Gergesenes) after the city of Gadara, which lay south of the eastern shore of the lake. According to Mark, the demoniac was noisy and inflicting wounds on himself; in Matthew, the pair were so dangerous that people could not pass on that road—apparently an inference from Mark's colorful description (Mk. 5:3–5). Matthew does not like to put Jesus in the role of asking questions, and so omits his ascertaining the name of the demon. The demoniacs—really the demons—address him as "Son of God" (Mk.: Son of the Most High God), but they do not adjure him; they merely ask whether he has come to torture them before the time (i.e., of their final damnation). The story proceeds as in Mark, except that it is not said that the demons entered into the swine, and the number of the swine is omitted. The sequel is drastically cut. While the herdsmen report to the people of the city about the demoniacs, the citizens do no more than go forth "to a meeting of Jesus" and on seeing him ask him to leave. The missionary work of the healed man in Mk. 5:20 has no counterpart here.

9:1–8 The Healing of a Paralytic (Mk. 2:1–12; cf. 1:45; Lk. 5:17–26). The incident is reported on the basis of Mark, but with abridgment. There is no mention of the house scene or of lowering the sick man through the roof. How Jesus saw the faith of those who bore the man is thus less well explained than in Mark. The words of Jesus are, as usual, copied with little variation. In the conclusion, Matthew departs from Mark. He omits the saying of the people and records that they praised God who has given such power to *men.* The saying probably referred originally to the *Son of Man* (cf. Mk. 2:10).

9:9–13 The Call of Levi and Association with Publicans (Mk. 2:13–17; Lk. 5:27–32; cf. 15:1–2). Matthew omits Jesus' going forth from the house and teaching at the lakeshore (Mk. 2:13), but then relates the calling of the publican, changing the man's name to "Matthew." It seems probable that this change was made editorially at the time when this Gospel was being attributed to Matthew (cf. the Introduction). The supposition that Levi the son of Alpheus took the name of Matthew is improbable. If it were a Greek name the case would be different, but it is an everyday Hebrew name, Mathai (shortened form of Mattathiah).

When Jesus and his disciples were eating in their own house they were joined by many publicans and sinners (an alteration of Mark's assertion that Jesus ate in the publican's house). The objection of the Pharisees is put more strongly: "Why does he eat, etc.?" In commenting on this, Jesus gives the first part of the saying of Mk. 2:17, but then bids them go learn the meaning of Hos. 6:6, which puts mercy before sacrifice. His association with publicans and sinners is an act of mercy or love on his part, and as such more important than legalistic correctness of conduct.

9:14–17 The Question about Fasting (Mk. 2:18–22; Lk. 5:33–39). Matthew joins this material more closely to the preceding than does Mark; one gets the impression that it belongs to the scene of the meal just described. He drops the scribes and lets the disciples of John speak in the first person, joining themselves with the Pharisees in the matter of (special) fasting. Matthew, like Luke, omits Mk. 2:19b—Jesus' answer to his own rhetorical question about fasting while the bridegroom is with them.

9:18–26 The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood (Mk. 5:21–43; Lk. 8:40–56). Mark related this story after the healing of the Gerasene demoniac. Matthew has put it after the reply to the question of John's disciples.

He thus had to omit the setting of Mk. 5:21. Mark's "ruler of a synagogue" becomes a nameless "ruler" (Gr. *árchōn*) or prominent person. According to the text "he entered in" while Jesus was yet speaking (to John's disciples). Matthew cuts down Mk. 5:22–23a to the bare mention of the man's prostrating himself before Jesus. In Mark, the father states that his daughter is at the point of death and begs that she be saved and (remain a)live; here he reports that she has just died and entertains the hope that she will live (again). That Jesus "arose" and followed the man and that his disciples (did likewise) is phrased independently by Matthew. He leaves out mention of the crowd pressing after Jesus.

The incident of the woman is greatly abridged. Matthew has a succinct word for her ailment ("suffering from hemorrhage"), which he substitutes for Mark's phrase. He leaves out her medical history as well as her having heard "the things about Jesus." Since the crowd was left out above, it is also left out in v. 20, even though this robs the situation of its realism. The automatic healing from touching the hem of the garment of Jesus and all that followed this (Mk. 5:29–33) is omitted. Matthew merely has Jesus turn and see the woman. His words to her are prefaced with a kindly "take heart" (9:2), but are restricted to the assurance that her faith has saved her. Matthew adds that the woman was saved from that hour. The repeated use of the word "save" is characteristic of this incident. It means "delivered."

Since the ruler's daughter had been declared dead, Mk. 5:34–36 could not be used. But Matthew also leaves out the taking along of three disciples; he does not like to give some disciples prominence before others where he can avoid doing so (he could not in 17:1; 26:37). To the noisemakers at the ruler's house he adds the flute-blowers (Rev. 18:22), perhaps because in the Hellenistic world, in which Matthew lived, these were regularly present at such occasions. Jesus bids the mourners go away (instead of asking the question of Mk. 5:39), but says the same thing about the maiden as in Mark. The mourners are imagined as in the house; hence that he drove away the crowd is changed to "when the crowd was driven out." From here on, the story is cut to the barest essentials: he went in and seized her hand and the girl was raised up (from death). And this report went out into that whole land. (In Mark, Jesus requested silence concerning his act.) The colorful and interesting story of Mark has thus been reduced to a mere outline. But from a "theological" angle it has been made stronger. The faith of the woman and of the "ruler" stand out clearly, and there is no doubt about it that Jesus acted in freedom and sovereign power.

9:27–31 The Healing of Two Blind Men (cf. 20:29–34). Matthew felt compelled to include an instance of the healing of blindness in this series of miracle stories to prepare the way for 11:5. The one he gives at the same time replaces Mk. 8:22–26, which he omits at the corresponding point. It is, however, only an offshoot of 20:29–34 (= the healing of Bartimaeus, Mk. 10:46–52). Matthew has a fondness for substituting *two* persons for Mark's *one,* as already appeared in 8:28; this doubling enables him to avoid the semblance of relating another version of the same event in 20:29 ff.

The story is loosely linked to the preceding situation with its introductory "as Jesus went on from there." The blind men cry out after him with the same words as in 20:30. (Matthew puts the "son of David" last; cf. Mk. 10:47). It is surprising and artificial that Jesus pays no attention. When he "comes into the house" the blind men again come to him. Jesus asks them whether they believe that he is able to do this (i.e., heal them). They answer, "Yea, Lord." In this private situation he touches their eyes, saying, "According to your faith may it be unto you." Their eyes are opened, and he charges them to see to it that no one hears of it. Instead, they make him known in the whole region (cf. Mk. 1:45). The narrative is idealized, with all colorful details omitted and everything concentrated on whether the men have faith. The mention of "the house" may have suggested to the reader the similar healings carried out in the Apostolic Age in Christian meeting houses. Those healed were, naturally, great advertisers of the new religion. Jesus' command of silence is brought in to ward off any idea that miracle-working was a primary concern of Jesus or of the Church.

9:32–34 The Healing of a Dumb Demoniac (Cf. Lk. 11:14–15).

Just as Matthew has two versions of the healing of blindness, so he also has two of the healing of dumbness (cf. 12:22–24). He connects this incident closely with the preceding one. When the blind men came out of the house some people brought a dumb man who was possessed of a demon (of dumbness). The exorcism is not related. The reader can assume that it went as in 8:28–34. The real purpose of the incident is to be seen in the twofold reaction mentioned at its close. On the one hand, there is the public comment: nothing like that has ever happened in Israel (a variant of the comment in 12:23) and, on the other hand, the caustic remark of the Pharisees about Beelzebul (identical with 12:24). We thus have here a duplicate of 12:22–24 (where the man is both blind and dumb). Matthew defers the defense of Jesus against the Beelzebul accusation until it has been reiterated (12:22 ff.). The mention of the charge here is like the rumble of distant thunder.

9:35–10:16 The Sending out of the Disciples (Mk. 6:6, 34; 6:7; 3:14–19; 6:8–11; cf. Lk. 8:1; 9:1; 6:13–16; 9:2–5; 10:1–12).

vv. 35–36 Matthew has described the activities of Jesus as teacher and as wonder-worker. In summary manner this is covered once more in 9:35 (cf. 4:23). Jesus travels about in cities and villages; he teaches in the synagogues and proclaims the gospel of the kingdom; he heals every disease and every infirmity. What was said in Mk. 6:34 is also repeated: seeing the crowds he was filled with compassion for them, because they were *worn out and lying prostrate* (not in Mark), as sheep that have no shepherd (to lead them to green pastures). Reflection on Zech. 11:6 ff. may have suggested the addition.

vv. 37–38 A saying to the disciples reveals the great opportunity that Jesus saw in this situation. The harvest, he declares, is great, but the laborers are few. They are to pray, therefore, to the Lord of the harvest that he may send forth laborers into his harvest. This saying is used by Luke in connection with sending out the Seventy (Lk. 10:2), and the first part of it also appears in Jn. 4:35 f.

10:1 Matthew thereupon reveals the purpose of vv. 35–38. The twelve disciples themselves are to share in the work. Jesus calls them (presumably after an interval, which Matthew passes over as of no consequence) and confers on them power to drive out the unclean spirits (Mk. 6:7) and to heal "every disease and every infirmity." (This goes beyond Mark.)

vv. 2–4 Matthew now takes occasion to add a list of the names of the twelve "Apostles" (cf. Mk. 3:16–19; Lk. 6:14–16). He has not related their appointment, as Mark did in 3:14–15 and as Luke does in 6:13. *First* Simon, the one called Peter (4:18); the emphasis on this "first" suggests that Matthew is bent on exalting this individual—a purpose carried further in 16:18. It is worthy of note that Matthew avoids saying here that Jesus named Simon "Peter" (Mk. 3:16). Andrew is given the place after Simon (Mark had put him after James and John). Matthew is called "the publican" and put after Thomas (Mk.: before Thomas). After James the son of Alpheus a mysterious Lebbaeus, who probably owes his existence to a scribal error, appears in some manuscripts in place of Mark's Thaddeus; the younger manuscripts (cf. A.V.) harmonize: "Lebbaeus, who is called Thaddeus." There is a Simon the "Cananaean," as in Mark. The last is Judas the Iscariotes (R.S.V. changes to Mark's Iscariot), "the one who betrayed him." Iscariotes is a Hellenized form suggested by the *ot* ending of Iscariot (cf. *stratiōtēs,* "soldier," or *Italiōtēs,* "a Greek of Italy"). It gives no aid in clarifying the real meaning of Iscariot (cf. Mk. 3:19).

vv. 5–16 Matthew now records the sending out of the disciples and the instructions Jesus gave them. He has built this up into a second major discourse of Jesus, extending through v. 42. In vv. 5b–8 he prefixes special material of his own. The disciples are commanded not to "depart the way of the Gentiles" (i.e., take a road to a Hellenistic city), or to enter a city of the Samaritans, but to confine themselves to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (cf. 15:24). (Luke does not have this, since he favors Samaritan and Gentile missions; cf. also Mt. 28:19.) They are to preach the message of 4:17. They are to give freely as they have received. (In preparing for their short journeys) they are to acquire no money (by earning it with manual work, as the rabbis do?), spare clothing, sandals or staff (the last two items are permitted in Mark's version) —for "the workman is worthy of his hire" (a proverb?). Those whom they instruct will look out for their wants. In entering a city they are to investigate who is worthy (perhaps an addition, due to revision of the rules; cf. v. 13). They are to enter the house of a prospective host with a peace greeting. If it be a worthy house (i.e., willing to lend an ear to the Christian message) their "peace" will come upon it (i.e., the blessing inherent in their peace greeting will increase the house's welfare), but if it be unworthy their "peace" will return to them (somewhat like unused electrical power; it remains available for further use; cf. Is. 55:11). An Amen-saying threatens any unreceptive town (cf. his own experience, 11:20–24; 23:37) with a judgment worse than that still in store for Sodom and Gomorrah. They are being sent as sheep among wolves. Let them be wise as serpents (cf. Gen. 3:1, LXX) to find the way out of danger, and guileless as the doves (i.e., avoid all improper means; cf. Rom. 16:19)—possibly a popular saying. (The animal psychology is of popular origin.)

10:17–25 The Lot of the Disciples (Mk. 13:9–13; Lk. 21:12–17, 19)

vv. 17–22 The sayings here included appear in Mark in the Apocalypse of ch. 13. The initial warning has been strengthened by Matthew to "take heed of *men*" (Mk. "see to yourselves"). There are minor differences of phrasing and some additions and omissions. Thus Matthew in speaking of the witness they are to bear before governors and kings adds "and to the nations," but leaves out the saying about it being necessary for the gospel to be preached first to all nations (Mk. 13:10; used in Mt. 24:14). In place of the Holy Spirit's speaking in their stead Matthew has "the Spirit of the Father will be speaking in you."

v. 23 This saying, which is special material of Matthew, urges that when people pursue them in one city they shall flee to another, for they will not have gone through all the cities of Israel before the Son of man comes. This must be a very early saying, like 10:5, for the scope of missionary activity is restricted to Palestinian towns, and the return of Christ is expected before the disciples can have gone to all of them. Gentile mission work is not even thought of. Since the expected return did not materialize and since Gentile missions came up, the objective was revised: the gospel had first to be preached to all nations.

vv. 24–25 Matthew puts here the saying that the disciple is above his teacher in the sense that the disciples can expect no better fate than that of Jesus. The saying is enriched with the further comparison of master and slave, not found in Lk. 6:40 (Q), where the original point becomes clear. Matthew then adds another saying leading over to the more immediate situation in which the disciples will find themselves as they go forth: if they call the householder (= Jesus) Beelzebul (not explained until 12:22 f. but already hinted at in 9:34) how much more (will they revile) those of his household.

10:26–33 Exhortation to Fearless Confession (Lk. 12:2–9), Q

vv. 26–28 Let them not be afraid of them (the men of v. 17). Matthew puts here (in v. 26) a saying about nothing being hidden that will not be known (construed as meaning that what Jesus has spoken secretly the disciples are to make known publicly; but cf. the more original use made of it in Mk. 4:22; Lk. 8:17). This is then vividly elaborated in v. 27 f. where the material is from Q, since Luke also has it. The transitional idea is that their preaching will arouse serious opposition. Let them not fear those who can kill only the body and not the soul, but rather him who can destroy both body and soul in Gehenna (when God's judgment overtakes them). This saying employs an unusual idea of "soul" as something indestructible; elsewhere to lose the soul means "to lose life" (cf. v. 39).

vv. 29–30 These sayings are already found in this position in Q (cf. Lk. 12:6), but seem artificially forced into it. God looks out for the disciples, as he does for the sparrows that one can buy two for a "penny" (Gr. *assarion;* twenty-four to a denarius), and none of which "fall to the ground" (= perish; cf. 1 Sam. 26:20) without his will. Consciousness of this is to make them, who are worth so much more than sparrows, fearless (in confessing their Christian faith). Those who acknowledge Jesus before men he will acknowledge before God (in the judgment); similarly, their denial of him will bring denial of them on his part (cf. Mk. 8:38; Lk. 12:8). In this saying, Matthew omits the words "Son of Man," probably because the role here assigned to Jesus does not measure up to the august one he otherwise ascribes to the Son of Man.

10:34–36 Division in the Household (Lk. 12:51–53), Q. Let them be prepared for the worst. Jesus is not come to bring peace on earth (to the land of Palestine? in Hebrew and Aramaic the same word is used for both "earth" and "land"), but a sword. Lk. 12:51 gives this saying interrogatively and for "sword" substitutes "division" to avoid any misunderstanding of the figurative use of the concrete word. Matthew does not use Lk. 12:52. He quotes Micah 7:6, however, leading over to it with the words "for I have come to set a man against his father, etc." instead of "they will be divided father against son, etc." (Lk. 12:53). He continues with "and the enemies of a man will be his own household," probably Q material which Luke omitted.

10:37–39 The Conditions of Discipleship (Lk. 14:26, 27; 17:33), Q. One who loves parents and children (extended in Lk. 14:26) more than he loves Jesus is not worthy of him (Lk.: cannot be his disciple). Whoever does not take up his cross and follow him (likewise) is not worthy of him. The formulation varies from Lk. 14:27 in phraseology only. "Following" Jesus is a word weighted with meaning for Matthew. He adds here another Q saying that Luke has in different form in his section on the return of the Son of man (17:33): he who finds (= saves) his life will lose it, he who loses his life for his sake will find it. The same materials appeared together in Mk. 8:34–35 and are taken over from that source in Mt. 16:24–25 (Lk. 9:23–24).

10:40–11:1 Conclusion of the Discourse. Matthew closes with special material. Assurance is given that whoever receives the disciples receives Jesus, just as whoever receives him receives him who sent him (i.e., God). Hospitality as practiced in the ancient Near East made the missionary work possible, but it is worthy of note that it required some encouragement by a saying of Jesus. The promise is extended to include heavenly reward for showing hospitality to other classes of Christian travelers: (1) the prophet for his prophet-name (or status); they were next in importance to Apostles (1 Cor. 12:28); (2) the righteous man for his status as such; the Jewish terminology (cf. Lk. 1:6) is taken over unreflectingly, and here applied to Christians of high esteem; (3) these "little ones"—the general run of Christians. The saying about them is that of Mk. 9:41, but with infusion of "the little ones" and substitution of "for his disciples' name" for "because you bear the name of Christ." Therewith the charge which began in 10:5 is terminated.

v. 11:1 The narrative conclusion provides a transition. The sending out of the disciples was mentioned in 10:5 and so is not referred to here. Jesus is imagined as departing and traveling about in the cities without the Twelve. Their subsequent return is not described (cf. Mk. 6:30). Their mission is perhaps regarded by Matthew as continuing into the long future. It is obvious in any case that the charge looked beyond the time of the earthly life of Jesus.

11:2–6 The Question of the Baptist (Lk. 7:18–23), Q. The imprisoned John the Baptist sends two disciples to inquire whether Jesus is the one who is to come or not (cf. 3:11). Jesus bids them report to John what they hear and see (in observing his activities and those of his disciples). He quotes Is. 61:1 (where, however, two elements of the quotation—healing of lepers and raising of the dead—are not found; they have presumably been injected by Matthew with an eye to the deeds of Jesus). He then adds a warning for the impatient Baptist in the form of a Beatitude. John is in peril of taking offense (lit. "stumbling") as the disciples were later (26:31), and needs to be "pulled up." The reply remains cryptic to the outsider, but will be clear to the Baptist: Jesus is fulfilling the Messianic prophecies. Since the Baptist's followers continued as a sect (cf. Acts 19:1 f.), they had no directive from their master to attach themselves to Jesus (contrast Jn. 1:29 f.). On the survival of the sect see p. 123.

11:7–19 Jesus' Testimony concerning John (Lk. 7:24–30; 16:16; 7:31–35), Q. After mention of the departure of John's disciples, Jesus speaks to the public about John. In rhetorical manner he asks the crowd what they went forth into the wilderness to see. A swaying reed? A courtier? A prophet? The third question is climactic. Jesus declares that John is more: he is the messenger of redemption of Mal. 4:5, 6. That implies that the redemption itself is at hand.

v. 11 The Amen-saying about John's incomparable greatness rests on this interpretation of his function. But a peculiar qualification is added: the least in the kingdom of heaven (= the new order beginning with Jesus) is greater than John. Ordinarily Jesus is not concerned about greatness. The saying may be a Christian formulation—Christians being considered a new humanity that began with Christ as the second Adam. John's disciples and their sect are being told by Matthew that they stand outside of it.

v. 12 A further saying in which John is mentioned follows—one of the most difficult in the Gospel. The words "since the days of John the Baptist until now" can hardly have been spoken by the historical Jesus—certainly not at a time when the Baptist was still alive! These words are not found in Luke's version of the saying (Lk. 16:16) and may have been added by Matthew. The starting point for interpretation must be "the kingdom of heaven is suffering violence, and violent ones are taking it by force." It is not clear who the "violent ones" are. If the saying is basically authentic then the word could refer to human enemies such as Herod (Lk. 13:31) or to hostile Satanic forces. But if it is imagined as spoken by the living Christ to the Church it could refer to the Zealots of the fifties or sixties A.D., who sought to bring about realization of the kingdom by violence. The saying would then portray the Zealot movement—though belonging to the new order—as a false counterpart of the Christian one. The divergent form of the saying in Lk. 16:16 is more easily understandable, but not necessarily more original in all respects. Matthew regards the kingdom as present in Jesus (cf. also 11b).

vv. 13–15 In Luke this saying precedes the one about the violent ones and contrasts the Old Testament era (ending with John) with the time of Jesus; Matthew links it with what follows. All the Prophets and the Law (the latter is put in second place to prevent the interpretation that John was just another prophet) prophesied (of the Messianic times) until John (who not only prophesied but acted). He is the Elijah who is about to come (Mal. 4:5)—if one is willing to accept it. This goes further than 11:10 had done, but the uncertainty is surprising. (In Mk. 9:11–13 it was stated more positively, but only to three intimate disciples, whereas here the crowds are being addressed.) Matthew must be including John in the old order, in view of v. 11b. The concluding exhortation of v. 15 (cf. Mk. 4:9) calls special attention to this remark, for to those accepting this it is proof that the Messianic Age has begun. In Luke 16:16 the saying reads: "The Law and the Prophets (are) until John; from then on the kingdom of God is being preached." That is clearer than what Matthew has, but if it is more original one can see why Matthew did not like it and would want to change it: it seemed to assert that the validity of the Law and the Prophets ended with John the Baptist. Since Matthew has declared that the Law will never pass away (5:18), this would not do.

vv. 16–19 Yet another piece in which John was mentioned is put here by Matthew. It is also from Q. Matthew does not have Luke's introduction (7:29–30), but otherwise they parallel each other closely. A distinctive feature of it is that Jesus and John are here taken together, whereas in the preceding pieces John belonged to an older order. Jesus asks to whom he shall compare this generation? He replies: to children who accuse other children of not joining in the games for which they called by whistling or wailing (playing weddings and funerals?). John came in ascetic manner and the people said he was possessed of a demon; the Son of man came, ate and drank, and they say: "Behold, the man is a glutton and wine-drinker (Prov. 23:30), a friend of publicans and (other) sinners. (So they would not play to the tune called by either one.) And Wisdom (i.e., God's) was justified by its *works* (i.e., by what it did in sending the two). Thus men are unmasked as willfully uncooperative; they heed neither John's call to mourning nor Jesus' call to gladness. (Therefore, nothing remains but for God to send the judgment.) In Lk. 7:35 the final words are: "Wisdom was justified by (= over against) all its children" (meaning the Jews). This is possibly the more original text; the Old Syriac version so reads. It has not yet been explained satisfactorily how the reading "works" arose. The saying in its present form seems rather retrospective to have been spoken by Jesus.

11:20–24 Woes over Galilean Cities (Lk. 10:13–15), Q. The preceding section provides a transition to this one. In this Q material, woes are pronounced upon three cities in which Jesus had done miracles (Gr. *dýnamis;* cf. 7:22), but which had not repented: Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum. No account is given in the Gospels of any visit to Chorazin, only a short distance from Capernaum, though it was certainly the next place Jesus would have gone to on his first departure from Capernaum to the interior (Mk. 1:38). Bethsaida (here Bethsaidan) is the scene of a miracle report (Mk. 8:22 f.); in Jn. 1:44 it is even made the city of three disciples. Tyre and Sidon, Jesus says, would have repented in sackcloth and ashes. The saying on Capernaum is less clear, and different manuscript readings make possible several interpretations (cf. R.S.V. and A.V.). The formulation was influenced by Is. 14:13; Capernaum ascended into heaven (through the presence in it of Jesus), but it will descend to Hades. Those in Sodom would have repented and the city would still be standing had like miracles been done there; the land of the Sodomites will fare better on the Judgment Day than Capernaum. These sayings hardly suit Jesus' ministry, since he was successful in gaining a big following in Galilee. It seems probable that these are sayings of the heavenly Christ, given to a Christian prophet looking back upon the collapse of Christianity in this area. For it is clear that Christianity began in Galilee and not in Jerusalem, as Luke would have it (cf. Mk. 14:28; 16:7). The disciples and the family of Jesus were probably driven out by the Jews. The emphasis on Jesus as miracleworker likewise fits retrospect better.

11:25–27 The Utterance of Rejoicing (Lk. 10:21–22), Q. According to Lk. 10:21, this Q material begins as an inspired utterance of rejoicing. Jesus thanks the Father that he has hidden this (i.e., the insight into the truth of the gospel) from the wise, and revealed it to those who are (relatively) babes. The concluding words, "Yea, Father, for thus it was pleasing before thee" (cf. 18:14), praise God for having so decreed. This is much like the attitude of Paul in 1 Cor. 1:21.

v. 27 The originally separate nature of this saying is shown by the fact that Lk. 10:21 prefaces it with a special introduction as spoken to the disciples. Jesus asserts that all things (i.e., all those pertaining to the knowledge of God; cf. 13:11) have been given to him by the Father. [No one knows the Son except the Father;] no one knows the Father except the Son and the one to whom the Son is willing to reveal (it). Knowledge of God for the Jews was something given by teacher to pupil (Gr. *parádosis,* tradition); the related verb is used here for "given." The statement thus does not have the broad meaning many suppose it to have. The concluding clause perhaps should read "and to whom the son wills, he reveals it," for ancient versions have a finite verb rather than an infinitive. The bracketed words which make the Son a mystery for men are probably a later addition. In quotations of the passage by early Christian writers it is often placed differently—a fact indicating that such a text element is an uncertain quantity. Even without it this saying stands somewhat apart from the rest of the Synoptic materials. The Q source has evidently been influenced here by the line of tradition that produced the Gospel according to John.

11:28–30 The Invitation to Those with Burdens. One of the best-loved sayings of the New Testament, and peculiar to this Gospel, concludes the chapter: Jesus invites those who are weary and bearers of heavy burdens, promising them "rest," and describing the "yoke" that he lays on men's shoulders as light (in contrast to that laid on them by the Pharisees; cf. 23:4 = Lk. 11:46). In the conclusion of Sirach (Ecclus. 51:23–27) there is a comparable invitation by the personified divine Wisdom, in which people are urged to assume its yoke and in which the speaker refers to the "rest" he found in it. Familiarity with the Sirach passage apparently helped to form this particular utterance. The remark "for I am gentle and lowly of heart" should be rendered "who am gentle, etc." Lowly of heart (= mind) means "humble." It refers to the concern of Jesus with the common people. He is not proud and does not despise them, as do the scribes.

12:1–8 Plucking Grain on the Sabbath (Mk. 2:23–28; Lk. 6:1–5). Matthew here rejoins Mark, but with some slight changes and additions. He notes that the disciples were hungry when they plucked grain, and that the Pharisees saw them do it. He adds mention of "Abiathar the high priest." To the example of David's eating the shew bread is joined in vv. 5–7 that of permissible priestly violation of the Sabbath in the case of its conflicting with duties prescribed for a certain time in the law (cf. Lev. 24:8 f.; Num. 28:9 f.). Jesus declares that here is more than the Temple (an allusion to his being the Messiah; the disciples were serving him, as the priests serve the Temple); and that had the Pharisees understood Hos. 6:6, "I desire mercy not sacrifice" (already used in 9:13), they would not have condemned the innocent (disciples). (That innocence, however, cannot be regarded as proved by this allusion.) The highly effective saying of Mk. 2:27 is omitted, but 2:28 is retained and strengthened by omission of the "also," "for (because he is the Messiah and more than the Temple) the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath." The addition of vv. 5–7 to the story seemed desirable to justify this final assertion.

12:9–14 The Healing of the Withered Hand (Mk. 3:1–6; Lk. 6:6–11). Matthew follows Mark with some changes. In the introductory sentence he brings in the travel idea. The indirect question of Mk. 3:2 is made direct and general: whether it is lawful to heal on a Sabbath. (In v. 14 we learn that the Pharisees asked it.) The command of Jesus to the man with the withered hand, Mk. 3:3, is omitted. Having made the question general, Matthew can introduce in vv. 11–12a some Q material (Lk. 14:5). Jesus propounds a counterquestion: Who of them having one (Semitism, = a) sheep that fell into a pit on the Sabbath would not get hold of it and lift it out? (Cf. on Lk. 14:5 for the original form of this saying.) How much more is a man worth than a sheep! Hence it is permissible to do good on the Sabbath. The act of healing is then reported as in Mark, but with omission of colorful detail. In the final sentence the Herodians (22:16) are dropped as fellow conspirators of the Pharisees.

12:15–21 Jesus Heals the Crowds (Mk. 3:7–12; Lk. 6:17–19). Matthew here gives only a meager digest of Mark. He explains the departure of Jesus "from there" (in Mk., Capernaum is implied by the connection) as due to his knowing of the council taken to destroy him. Many people follow him. (Mark elaborates on whence they came.) He healed them all (Mk. 3:10: many), but commanded that they should not reveal him (= Mk. 3:12, but there addressed to the unclean spirits). Matthew then, however, introduces something not found in Mark—allusion to the fulfillment of a prophecy. He quotes Is. 2:1–4, but in a text form differing from both the LXX and the Hebrew. This illustrates the freedom with which Scripture could be dealt with by these Spirit-guided men. The words "whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased" are allusions to the divine oracle at the Baptism (3:17; cf. 17:5). "He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the street" is an interpretative rendering of Is. 42:2 ("not does he cry out and not does he lift up his voice"), construing it as referring to Jesus' seeking to get away from all hostility and publicity by going to lonely places. That "he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smoldering wick" hints at his consideration for the unfortunate (cf. v. 15). "Until he brings justice to victory" is a free rendering of Is. 42:4b "till he has established justice in the earth." The justice meant is that of God over against the world. Use of the word "victory" made this a significant expression of the future triumph of God's cause through Jesus. The final "in his name will the Gentiles hope" is the LXX reading of Is. 42:4c, and what is meant is later illustrated by the story of the Canaanite woman (15:21–28).

12:22–24 The Pharisaic Accusation (Mk. 3:20–22; Lk. 11:14–16). Matthew has already given the list of the Apostles in ch. 10 and (like Luke) has no desire to include what Mark reports about the attempted seizure of Jesus by his family (Mk. 3:20–21). He wants to lead over to Mk. 3:22, and again like Luke, introduces a miracle. Such agreement suggests that each had his eye on another source. A blind and dumb demoniac is brought to Jesus. Since in Luke only dumbness is mentioned, the word "blind" was evidently added by Matthew to differentiate this healing from 9:32–34 (of which it is only a variant). The crowds were astounded at the healing, and doubting their own previous unbelief, asked: "Is not this one (who can do such miracles) the (promised) Son of David (cf. Jn. 7:31)?" The Pharisees (Mk.: scribes from Jerusalem), hearing this, vilified Jesus, saying, "This one does not cast out demons except by Beelzebul, ruler of the demons." (The assertion in Mk. that Jesus is possessed of Beelzebul is left out.) The quest of privacy hinted at in 12:15 is lost sight of.

12:25–37 The Defense of Jesus (Mk. 3:23–30; Lk. 11:17–23; 12:10; 6:43–45), Q

vv. 25–29 Jesus, "knowing their thoughts" (cf. Lk. 11:17), replies to the Pharisees (Mk.: he called them to him and spoke in parables). The material here presented also appeared in divergent form in Q, as we see from Luke (who puts it in a different connection), and Matthew used both Mark and Q here in eclectic manner. The opening verse corresponds at the beginning to Lk. 11:17, but then passes to Mk. 3:25. In v. 26 the question form of Lk. 11:18 is retained, but the idea that Satan is divided against himself is prefaced with "if Satan drives out Satan." In vv. 27–28, when Jesus comes to the allegation of his driving out demons through Beelzebul, Q (= Lk. 11:19–20) is followed. The Q statement "By whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges" (= they disprove your assertion) refers to the Jews in general, and would seem to indicate that Matthew's making this an address to the Pharisees is artificial and that Luke's "some of them" (i.e., of the people witnessing the healing, Lk. 11:15) is more original. This Q question, however, does not fit very well in the present connection—it suggests the viewpoint that exorcism is nothing unusual, whereas the point of Jesus is that his driving out of demons through God's spirit (Lk. more originally: God's finger) is a sign that God's kingdom has come (stronger than "is near at hand"). It is being assailed by Satan's host, and Jesus is carrying on the battle in driving out the demons. In vv. 29–30 the material corresponds to Lk. 11:21–23 rather than to Mk. 3:27, but in the beginning is turned into a question: How can one enter a strong man's house unless one first bind him? The question implies that Jesus has previously overcome Satan (at the Temptation, 4:1–11, Q), whose minions, therefore, are unable to withstand him.

v. 30 "He who is not with me is against me" while here taken from Q (Lk. 11:23) does not seem to fit the situation of v. 25 (cf. Mk. 9:40). It is a warning for the Christian reader. Resolute partisanship for Jesus is necessary; it gathers (cf. 23:37), while lack of it scatters (the Christian congregation).

vv. 31–32 The saying about blasphemy follows here as in Mk. 3:28–29, whereas Luke puts it in 12:10. Matthew changes Mark's "amen" to a "therefore." (Since your accusation is false it is a blasphemy of the Holy Spirit that is working in and through Jesus, v. 28.) He rearranges the Marcan form of v. 31 (Mk. 3:28), and adds v. 32a in dependence on Q (= Lk. 12:10a); reverting to Mark he changes the latter's "blaspheming the Holy Spirit" to "saying anything against the Holy Spirit" and omits Mark's statement about such a one's guilt and the explanatory Mk. 3:30.

vv. 33–36 This material resembles the Lucan form of a saying in the Sermon on the Plain (Lk. 6:43–45), and hence is from Q, but Matthew refashions it to fit his purpose. Jesus says that one may make (the supposition) that a tree is good—then its fruit will be good; or that one may make the supposition that a tree is bad—then its fruit will be bad. Omitting Lk. 6:44b, Matthew injects a new thought in v. 34. Calling those he is addressing (viz., the Pharisees) a "brood of vipers" (3:7), Jesus asks how can they, being evil, speak good things? The mouth speaks out of the fullness of the heart (= mind). He then gives the saying of Lk. 6:45 that both the good and the bad persons bring forth (utterances) from their stored good or bad treasure (i.e., out of the heart; cf. 6:21).

v. 37 Matthew adds an important saying from his special material: that men will be accountable on the Judgment Day for every useless word (cf. 1 Tim. 5:13); they will be justified or condemned on the basis of their utterances. (That of v. 24 is an evil one.) It makes a fitting conclusion to the discourse that began in v. 25.

12:38–42 Against Seeking for Signs (Lk. 11:29–32, Q; cf. Mk. 8:11–12). Before going on to Mk. 3:31 f. Matthew here brings in two pieces from Q. For the first, a declaration against seeking signs, he provides an introduction formulated under influence of Mk. 8:11–12 (the differently placed Marcan version). Some scribes and Pharisees answer Jesus (who has assailed them so sharply in vv. 31–35), saying that they wish to see a sign. (In Luke he begins to speak when the crowds are increasing.) Jesus describes the request as that of an evil and adulterous generation, and says no sign shall be given it except that of Jonah (cf. 16:4). The Q source had gone beyond Mark, according to whom Jesus refused any sign whatsoever, and had spoken of the sign of Jonah. For Matthew, Jonah's sojourn in the belly of the whale (Jon. 3:17) is the sign; it is taken as allegorical of Jesus' sojourn in the heart of the earth (= Hades; cf. "heart of heaven," Deut. 4:11). "Three days and three nights" does not fit very precisely, for the resurrection of Jesus is described as occurring "on the third day" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:4), but suits the "after three days" generally used by Mark. Early Christians found the analogy sufficiently close, and did not mind the small difference in time. In vv. 41 f. Jesus states that the men of Nineveh will condemn this generation in the judgment, for they repented. And here is more than Jonah (viz., the Messiah). The Queen of the south (Heb. *yāmīn* < Yemen? Sheba, 1 Kings 10:1) will arise and condemn (probably Aramaism for "accuse") this generation, since she came such a distance to hear Solomon; and here is more than Solomon! (In Lk. the order of the two sayings is reversed. His idea of "the sign" fits better with this material, but Matthew satisfies the requirement for a sign much better. If Matthew is right then vv. 41–42 were artificially put here in Q; mention of Jonah seemed to make this an appropriate point for placing them.)

12:43–45 The Saying on Relapse (Lk. 11:24–26), Q. The second Q piece interpolated here by Matthew describes the going forth and possible return of an exorcised spirit. In Luke this is put immediately after the Beelzebul discourse and forms its conclusion. However, in that position it really vitiates the argument. Matthew may have shifted it for that reason. The waste places and ruins of cities are the natural habitat of demons (Rev. 18:2), though they find "rest" (a home, Ruth 1:9) only in invading a body.

The evil spirit that has known such rest seeks to return to the house (fig. for the person) it formerly inhabited. Finding the house swept and put in order (a demon is a filthy housekeeper), he goes to fetch seven other spirits of a worse class. ("The seven" were a distinct group in the Babylonian demonology which had so successfully invaded Judaism.) They take up their abode in the man, and he is much worse than he was originally. Exorcism thus in many cases brought only a temporary relief. Relapse is blamed on the return of the demon. Matthew (unlike Luke) adds a statement which converts this description into a parable: so shall it be with this evil generation. But the interpretation seems forced.

12:46–50 Jesus' True Relatives (Mk. 3:31–35; Lk. 8:19–21). Matthew here reverts to Mark's narrative. That Jesus' mother and brethren are "outside" does not fit the situation of his addressing the people, but rather the house situation of Mk. 3:19b. Originally the only reference to an informant was in v. 48, for v. 47 is missing in most important codices, e.g., S and B and in the Old Syriac texts. Matthew omits the allusion to the disciples sitting in a circle, and in the saying of Jesus substitutes for God "my Father in heaven."

13:1–9 Parable of the Sower (Mk. 4:1–9; Lk. 8:4–8). Matthew now presents a third extended discourse of Jesus, consisting of seven parables of the kingdom (13:3b–51). In the introduction, vv. 1–3a, he has Jesus go forth from "the house"—evidently with an eye on Mk. 3:19b. He replaces the opening statement of Mark with the further words "he sat beside the sea." The description of how pressure from the crowd forced him to enter a boat and do his teaching from that point of vantage follows Mark. The words "he said to them in the teaching" and the invitation "hear ye" are left out. The parable of the sower is taken verbatim from Mark with omission of a few phrases in vv. 7, 8, 9.

13:10–15 The Reason for Parables (Mk. 4:10–12; Lk. 8:9–10). Matthew clarifies the cumbersome statement of Mk. 4:10: the disciples approach Jesus and ask him why he speaks in parables. In the reply of Jesus the contrast between the disciples and the others is put differently than in Mark. To them it is given to *know* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but it is not given to others. Here Matthew utilizes the saying found in more simple form in Mk. 4:25, "Who has, to him shall be given and he will have abundance; but whoever has not, also what he has shall be taken from him." He then steers back to the Marcan presentation (cf. Mk. 4:12) by having Jesus say, "Therefore I speak to them in parables." But Matthew omits the final statement of that verse ("lest they repent, etc."). Instead, he quotes as fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah 6:9–10, of which Mark (without mention of the source) used a portion. The text is in almost exact accord with the LXX.

13:16–17 Blessed Eyewitnesses (Lk. 10: 23–24). At the beginning of his next piece Mark had given a saying in which Jesus rebukes the Twelve for asking him about the parable of the sower. Since Matthew changed their question in 13:10 he can replace this with a saying from Q (Lk. 10:23, with deletion of the mention of the situation) and make that the effective conclusion of the reply to the disciples. He gives the equivalent of the Lucan Beatitude as "blessed are your eyes that they see, your ears that they hear." ("That" is probably not "because," for the underlying Semitic equivalent was "which.") This shifts the attention from what is seen to the ones seeing. The final saying has "prophets and righteous men" (cf. 10:41) in place of Luke's "prophets and kings."

13:18–23 The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mk. 4:13–20; Lk. 8: 11–15). Jesus bids the disciples hear (the interpretation of) the parable of the sower. (On the omission of Mk. 4:13 cf. above on 13:16.) The fine opening in Mark, "the sower sows the word," is sacrificed. But this is intentional, for Matthew is not thinking of the act of sowing so much as of the land on which the seed is sown, and which to him stands for a type of church member. This ecclesiastical interest becomes even clearer in the parable that follows. In the case of everyone who hears the word of the kingdom (4:23, 9:35) and does not understand it, the Evil One (Mk.: Satan) comes and robs what was sown in his heart: this is the one sown by the wayside. (The identification is thus put last and singularized.) The second kind of land is mentioned at the outset and the text follows Mark except that the plural "these are the ones" is again singularized ("this is he who"). The same thing is done with the third kind of land. In that description Mark's "and the desire for other things, enter in" is omitted. With the fourth kind of land, "understanding" the Word is substituted for "receiving," and the order of the quantities of fruit produced is reversed (a more pessimistic presentation). Matthew thus has his eye on the Christian individual in his congregations; Mark had his on the work of the sower.

13:24–30 Parable of the Tares. Matthew omits the parable of the seed growing secretly (Mk. 4:26–29) and substitutes this one from his special material. The initial "it may be compared" formula is merely a more elegant rendering in Greek of the basic Semitic "to" referred to above on p. 57. The point of the comparison is not the person mentioned, but the situation described. A man sows good wheat seed on his field; his enemy comes at night and sows seed of weeds. When the seed has come up and has reached the point where wheat develops spikes, the presence of the weeds becomes noticeable. The unique word used for "weeds" (Gr. *zizánia*) is no doubt a Semitic loan word and perhaps corrupted. The weed meant is the *lolium temulentum* (in Arab. *Zuwwān* or *Zauwān;* in Mishnaic Heb. *Zonīn;* Aram. *Zonayyā; zny,* miswritten *zzny,* producing *zizania?*). It looks so much like wheat that some ancients held it to be a variety which changes its nature in the ground. On discovering it the servants report the situation to the man. He divines what has happened and rejects the suggestion of pulling out the weeds. Let both grow till the harvest time; then he will instruct the harvesters to gather and burn the weeds, but bring the wheat into his barns. Jesus is not speaking of model agricultural practice; the people of Palestine do their weeding in April, and at this time the *lolium* can easily be distinguished. Nor would the weed be burned by the farmers; its seed is excellent for poultry. Under the veneer of a parable Jesus is describing how it is with God's kingdom; the details are invented to fit the intended meaning. He stresses the patience of God, who allows the good and the evil to coexist until the time comes to destroy the latter. This implies at the same time that it is not the function of the disciples to separate the good from the bad here and now. For a further interpretation, cf. below, 13:36 ff.

13:31–32 Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mk. 4:30–32; Lk. 13:18–19). Matthew introduces this Marcan parable, substituting the "is like" start for the interrogative beginning. As was the case with "may be compared" in 13:24, "is like" reflects the basic Semitic *le*. Instead of saying in passives what was done with the mustard seed, Matthew relates that a man took it and sowed it in his field. For "putting forth large branches" he substitutes "it becomes a tree," but for the birds "being able to make nests in its shade" he says that "the birds of heaven come and make nests in its branches (cf. Dan. 4:9, 18)."

13:33 Parable of the Leaven (Lk. 13: 20–21), Q. This short parable is introduced in the way the preceding one was. It is not found in Mark, but appears in Luke at this point, and hence is from Q. In Luke the first sentence is a question, as was the case in Mark with the parable of the mustard seed. The parable itself is identical in wording in both sources. A housewife takes leaven and conceals it (perhaps a reference to covering overnight with cloth) in three measures (Gr. *saton* > Aram. *sāthā*) of wheat flower—the huge quantity is unrealistic, cf. Gen. 18:6, but suits what Jesus is thinking of—until the dough rises before baking. The contrast again is between the glorious final nature of the kingdom and its present incipient status, seen only in the mission and message of Jesus.

13:34–35 The Parabolic Way of Teaching (Mk. 4:33–34). Matthew uses Mark's summary statement, but changes it. He omits that Jesus spoke the Word to the people as they were able to hear it and also that he privately explained everything to his disciples. He adds instead a different explanation for the speaking in parables: Jesus had to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah. (Codex D and the Old Syriac omit Isaiah.) The quotation then given is from Ps. 78:2. Only the first line, "I will open my mouth in parables," conforms to the LXX text; the second line, "I will utter what has been hidden since the foundations of the world," is an interpretative restatement of what the LXX offers ("I will speak the things that are questions from the beginning"). This is taken to mean that the kingdom of which Jesus spoke in parables has been prepared since the beginning of the world (25:34). Matthew thus gives a religiously more satisfying explanation of the method used by Jesus than the one hinted at in Mk. 4:33b. It would seem that this was formulated to provide a powerful conclusion of the parable section. But it then was supplemented by a commentary on 13:24–30 and by three further parables.

13:36–43 The Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares. Matthew relates Jesus' dismissal of the crowd and his return "to the house." He thus departs from Mark, who here tells of a lake crossing (which Matthew already has used in ch. 8:23 ff.). It is surprising to have the disciples ask for interpretation of the parable of the tares, because this was omitted in the case of the parable of the sower (cf. 13:10 and Mk. 4:10 f.), and since the disciples later claim that they do understand the parables (13:51). This interpretation must be regarded as Matthew's own contribution, and makes an allegory of the parable.

The owner of the field, surprisingly, is identified with the Son of man instead of with God, and his enemy is the Devil. The Son of man sowing the seed is carrying on an activity on earth. The sons of the kingdom are the good seed. The harvest is the end of the world (= the judgment), the reapers are the angels sent to carry out the judgment.

The separation of the good and the bad—the thing on which the interest is here concentrated—is described in a manner suggesting that it was of particular concern to the churchman who worded it thus. The angels will remove out of the kingdom and cast into the fiery oven (fig. for Gehenna and derived from the Tophet of 2 Kings 23:10, etc.) all offenses (really snares causing him who gets his foot in one to fall, but here meaning persons giving offense, as in 16:23 and those doing (deeds of) lawlessness (cf. on 7:23). But "the righteous" will shine like the sun (Judges 5:31; cf. Dan. 12:3) in the kingdom of their Father. The kingdom of the Son of man and the kingdom of God are differentiated in this verse: the former is evidently the Church (cf. 16:18). The historical Jesus would hardly have spoken in this way; he considered God, rather than himself, the owner of the field and Lord of the kingdom. The new interpretation makes the parable fruitful for the Church of Matthew's time. It mirrors a significant progress of thought in differentiating two periods in the history of the kingdom.

13:44–46 Parables of the Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl of Great Price. These short parables, which begin with "is like" (cf. on 13:31), form a pair. The first is based on an action that was resorted to every now and then, especially in times of war and invasion: burying a hoard of coins in an earthenware pot in one's field. (The ground in and around a house was apt to be searched.) If catastrophe overtook the owner a successor to his land would know nothing about it. But some day erosion of soil might lay bare a bit of the surface of the pot so that a passer-by could espy it. The parable assumes that someone who was not the owner of the field discovered such a hoard, but covered it up again. (He was too scrupulous to steal it, too wise to report it.) He then went and sold all he had to buy the field and so (by legalistic standards) acquired rightfully what it contained.

The second parable tells of the merchant who sought fine pearls ("fine" is missing in the Sinaitic Syriac) and found an especially valuable one in the hands of a dealer. Appreciating its marvelous quality he sold all he had in order to buy this unique jewel. Here the value may not have been much greater than the dealer suspected; the point lies in the merchant's appreciation of this rare object and his willingness to take the radical action necessary to obtain it. So it is with those who would enter the kingdom (contrast those of Lk. 9:57–62).

13:47–50 Parable of the Dragnet. This third parable also begins with "is like." The kingdom is here compared with (the situation that results when) a dragnet was cast into the sea, which gathered fish of all kinds. When the fishermen had pulled it upon the shore, they sat down to sort out the fish, putting the good ones into baskets, but discarding the "bad" fish. (Cf. Lev. 11:9–12. The adjective really means "rotten," but that does not suit fish freshly netted and shows that the word is used loosely for those not to be eaten because considered unclean.) The immediate sorting of good and bad contrasts strongly with the parable of the tares. The concluding application, however, is in the same vein as the explanation of that parable. The angels, at the end of this world age, will go forth and take out the wicked from the midst of the righteous (note limited congregational frame of reference) and do with them as in v. 42.

13:51–52 Conclusion of the Parable Discourse. Jesus asks the disciples whether they understand all these things (mentioned since v. 36). Receiving an affirmative reply, he concludes with a short parable. It is introduced by a "therefore" which, however, may be only an editorial link. The thought may be that since they understand the mysteries of the kingdom they (now?) are scribes taught for the kingdom. The Jewish teachers were scribes, concerned with interpretation, notably of the Law of Moses. The disciples of Jesus (and their successors the Christian teachers) are more concerned with prophecy. The parable does not have the abbreviated formula met with in the preceding ones. Every scribe taught (i.e., trained) for the kingdom is like a householder who brings out from his storeroom (12:35)—perhaps for display to his guest—both new and old things (recent manufactures and antiques? new acquisitions and heirlooms?). The Christian scribe has scriptural prophecy, but also adds new interpretation, as was demonstrated in the use of Scripture in vv. 14–15 and v. 35.

13:53–58 Jesus Rejected in Nazareth (Mk. 6:1–6; Lk. 4:16–30). Matthew has already used the materials of Mk. 4:35–5:43 in 8:23–34, 9:18–26, and Mk. 6:7–13 in 10:1–14. He here gives the visit of Jesus to Nazareth.

He leads over to it by saying that on finishing the parables Jesus departed, and in restating Mark's story abridges slightly. He omits mention of taking along the disciples, reference to the next Sabbath (which implied a stay of at least several days), his marveling at the unbelief of the Nazarenes, and his going forth to the villages of the environment. Matthew also shortens the wondering remark of the Nazarenes, as well as Jesus' reply, which here has the form: "A prophet is not without honor except in his own country and in his own house." Instead of describing Jesus as the carpenter, the people call him "the carpenter's *son.*" Mark's assertion that Jesus could not do a single miracle there (modified secondarily in Mk. 6:5b) is changed to read: "He did not do *many* miracles there on account of their unbelief." (Mk.: he marveled because of their unbelief.)

14:1–2 Herod's Opinion of Jesus (Mk. 6:14–16; Lk. 9:7–9). The connection established with the preceding by the introductory "at that time" is purely editorial and not to be stressed. Matthew abridges Mark's narrative, but preserves its main elements. He correctly calls Herod "tetrarch" (though in 14:9 he uses "king"), and dwells solely on his hearing of Jesus and his expressing the belief that Jesus was John come back to life, omitting what other people were saying.

14:3–12 The Death of the Baptist (Mk. 6:17–29; cf. Lk. 3:19–20). Mention of John had led Mark to introduce as a flash back the story of the Baptist's death. Matthew follows suit, but abridges. His opening statement reads as though the tetrarch had personally seized and jailed John (cf. similar folk-tale type of simplification, 1 Kings 18:6). He attributes to Herod himself rather than to Herodias the desire to kill John (v. 5), but makes him hesitate out of fear of the crowd, which held him "as a prophet" (cf. 11:9). This, however, is inconsistent with the subsequent grief of Herod in v. 9. It is probable that Matthew has culled v. 5 from a connection in which it referred to Jesus rather than to John; for Luke 13:31 has also preserved a remark that Herod wanted to kill Jesus. Omitting the allusion of Mk. 6:21 to the favorable day (for the scheme of Herodias), he relates that the celebration of the birthday (cf. on Mk. 6:21) of the ruler having come, "the daughter of Herodias" danced in the midst (of the stag party). Her name is omitted. (This would be particularly understandable if Matthew wrote in Syria, for she had later married a Syrian prince on whom Nero conferred the kingship of Lesser Armenia.) The girl's performance pleased Herod so much that he swore to give her whatever she might ask (Mk.: "ask of me what thou wishest"). Matthew leaves out the complicated going back and forth of Mk. 6:24–25 and merely says that, incited by her mother, she replied, "Give me" (said she) "here on a platter the head of John the Baptist." (Mk.: "I wish that you would give me right away on a platter, etc.") Matthew then relates the substance of Mk. 6:26–28, omitting mention of the guardsman. He does not, however, relate that John's body was put in a tomb; he is just "buried." He adds that John's disciples then went and told Jesus (what had happened). This item, however, is perhaps only an arbitrary twisting of the return of Jesus' own disciples, reported at the beginning of the next piece in Mk. 6:30 f.

14:13–21 (The Return of the Disciples and) the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:30–44; Lk. 9:10–17). According to Matthew, Jesus on hearing this departed thence in a boat to a desert place (to be) apart. But the story of the death of the Baptist was a flash back, relating something that had happened earlier. We have noted above that 14:5 must have been taken from a connection in which it referred to Jesus rather than to John. It seems very probable that the thing Jesus heard and that led him to seek a wilderness refuge was that Herod intended to kill him (Lk. 13:31). Such fugitive conduct may not have seemed worthy of the Lord in Matthew's time, and hence was changed by him. That Jesus sought privacy after receiving the report of the death of the Baptist could be interpreted by the reader as showing how deeply moved he was by that event. Matthew had to cancel the return of the disciples at this point, because they had already been sent out in 10:5 (not just before the story of the death of the Baptist as in Mk. 6:7) and have been referred to repeatedly as present with him. He thus could not use Mark's "retreat" idea, and could well entertain another explanation of the lake crossing.

The story of the feeding is abridged. Matthew merely notes that crowds on hearing (of Jesus' departure) followed him on foot from all the cities, and were on hand when he disembarked. The sympathy of Jesus was stirred at the sight of them, but he does not teach them as in Mark; rather, he heals their diseases (an interesting change of emphasis). In the account of the miracle Matthew makes stylistic improvements and omits some details, such as the allusion to the fields round about (Mk. 6:36), the remark about there being no need for the people to go purchase food, as well as the disciples' stupid question about their going to buy and the amount of money needed (6:37), and the question of Jesus about supplies on hand (6:38). He introduces a request of Jesus to bring the loaves and fishes they have with them (v. 17), and abridges the vivid description of how the disciples regulated the seating arrangements (Mk. 6:39–40) to a mere command of Jesus to the crowds to recline on the grass. The distribution act is fully preserved, except for omission of the fishes in v. 19, as also in the gathering of the fragments in v. 20. Matthew enhances the number of those present by saying it did not include the women and children. Some of the changes made are in the interest of protecting the disciples from criticism or of making their role more important, while others exalt Jesus more than in Mark's version.

14:22–33 Walking on the Water (Mk. 6:45–52; cf. Jn. 6:14–21).

vv. 22–27 Matthew's dependence on Mark is very obvious here. He has, however, made some changes. The puzzling mention of Bethsaida is left out in 14:22. Nothing is said of Jesus *seeing* the disciples in distress in rowing; Matthew simply states that the boat was in distress from waves. The mysterious item that Jesus wanted to pass by them (Mk. 6:48) is omitted. The crying out of the disciples is explained as "from fear."

vv. 28–31 Matthew here introduces a new element into the story, which greatly enriches it. Peter, after Jesus' saying of reassurance, addresses him as "Lord" and says that if it be really he, he should command him [Peter] to come to him on the waters. The command is given. Peter "going down from the boat" walked on the waters and came to Jesus. Seeing the wind (an oncoming squall?) he became frightened and began to sink. He cried out, "Lord, save me" (cf. 8:25). Jesus immediately extended his hand and took hold of him. He said to him, "O thou of little faith (6:30; 8:26), why didst thou doubt?" (The story has a parallel in the Buddhist sphere; *Jataka,* 190.)

vv. 32–33 Mark's text is rejoined here. But two persons, instead of one, enter the boat. Matthew has no use for Mark's conclusion. He omits the utter astonishment of the disciples and the explanation about their lack of understanding in spite of the miracle they had witnessed, and substitutes a scene of adoration with a chorus conclusion: the disciples prostrate themselves before Jesus and say: "Truly thou art the Son of God." This revision made the story more meaningful when it was read as a lesson or repeated as an illustration of a discourse, but in the narrative as a whole the Messianic confession of Caesarea Philippi (16:13 ff.) is robbed thereby of its significance.

14:34–36 The Return to Gennesar (Mk. 6:53–56). The mooring and disembarking are left out. "Gennesaret" (cf. on Mk. 6:53) is called a "place," which here apparently means a hamlet (cf. town and place Lk. 10:1), though in Mark's version it may be the name of the district. The men of that place send out the message into the whole district (Mk.: those recognizing him ran through that whole country). All the sick are brought to Jesus. Matthew leaves out the travel idea and that the sick were brought to Jesus on pallets wherever he was, but closes with the healings by their touching the hem of his garment.

15:1–20 On the Washing of Hands (Mk. 7:1–23).

vv. 1–9 Matthew makes not only the scribes but the Pharisees come from Jerusalem. He omits both the situation-description and the explanation of Jewish customs (Mk. 7:2–4), and continues directly with the question about the disciples not washing their hands before eating. Instead of answering with an ironical accusation utilizing Is. 29:13, Jesus here asks a counterquestion: Why do his opponents transgress God's law for the sake of their tradition? Matthew abridges and rearranges Mark's further material, bringing in the quotation from Is. 29:13 at the end. He omits the word "Corban" and substitutes "God" for "Moses" as author of the Commandments cited.

vv. 10–11 In the words addressed to a larger public, Matthew not only shortens but clarifies the saying about man's being defiled, not by what enters into him, but by what goes out of him (Mk. 7:15) by substituting "into the mouth" and "out of the mouth," but thereby makes unnecessary the explanation given to the disciples in vv. 15 ff.

vv. 12–14 Matthew here adds an incident from his special material. The disciples ask Jesus if he knows that the Pharisees have taken offense at his saying (viz., that of v. 11, which would seem to induce people to disregard laws of clean and unclean). Jesus replies that every plant not planted by his Father (Old Syriac: the Father) will be rooted up. The Pharisees are here regarded as such plants. Let them (take offense); they are blind leaders of the blind; in such a case, both the leaders and those led fall into a pit (old cisterns). Cf. Lk. 6:39.

vv. 15–20 Matthew omits the return to the house and makes Peter the spokesman for the disciples in requesting an explanation of the "parable." In the interpretation of the saying of v. 11, Matthew leaves out some of the more abstract sins in Mark's catalogue of those sins that go forth from the heart, and changes the order of those retained. He adds a final statement which declares flatly that nonwashing of hands does not defile.

15:21–28 The Canaanite Woman (Mk. 7:24–30). In Mark, Jesus went to the borders of Tyre; here to the *parts* of Tyre and Sidon. The woman of this story is described as a Canaanite; the name "Canaan" was used for Phoenicia—at least in the second century B.C. as coin inscriptions show. Matthew omits mention of Jesus' entering a house and of his desire for concealment. The Canaanite woman goes forth from the borders (meeting Jesus on Palestinian soil) and cries out after him, hailing him as "Lord, Son of David" (= Jewish Messiah) and imploring him to have mercy on her because her daughter is badly demon-possessed. Jesus does not answer the woman, whereupon the disciples suggest dismissing her (i.e., granting her request in order to get rid of her); but he utters the thought previously expressed in 10:6 that his mission is only to Israel. The woman now draws near, prostrates herself and begs, "Lord, help me." The dialogue between Jesus and the woman continues as in Mark, but the final response of Jesus is made more impressive, for he exclaims, "O woman, thy faith is great. May it be to thee as thou wilt." This praise of one who believes in the power and mercy of Christ is the most important element in the narrative. Matthew can now hasten to his conclusion: the girl was healed "from that hour." He has no use for the more vivid statement of Mk. 7:30.

15:29–31 The Healing of Many Sick (Mk. 7:31–37). Matthew, omitting Mark's difficult itinerary, brings Jesus back to the lake of Galilee—it being obscure to which side. He leaves out the healing of the deaf and dumb man of Mk. 7:31–37 and substitutes this scene: Jesus ascends a mountain and seats himself. It is as though he were creating a staging analogous to the one for the Sermon in 5:1. Here the sick are brought to him and he carries on a wide range of healing activity. The praise of Mk. 7:37 evidently seemed to Matthew to rest too narrowly on the foundation of a single healing. Besides, it needed broadening, for Jesus healed more than the dumb. But since Matthew has no quotation to fall back on, he reports that the crowds marveled in seeing the cures of the dumb, the maimed, the lame and the blind, and praised the God of Israel.

15:32–39 The Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mk. 8:1–10). Without change of scene Matthew introduces the feeding of the four thousand. The story presupposes a "desert" area (v. 33), and agrees poorly with the previous bringing of sick people to Jesus, which implied the proximity of villages. The connection is thus artificial. In reality 15:32–38 is a separate incident, as in Mark. That it is only a variant of the feeding of the five thousand is obvious (cf. on Mk. 8:1 ff.). In relating the story, Matthew follows Mark closely, but again, as in 14:13–21, omits special distribution of the fishes and adds "women and children" to the multitude. In the east-west lake crossing after the miracle (v. 39) they come to "the borders of *Magadan,*" rather than to Mark's "parts of Dalmanutha." Magadan is evidently a misspelling of Magdala (cf. on Mk. 8:10). Greek copyists did not understand the meaning of Semitic names and easily mutilated them.

16:1–4 The Pharisees Demand a Sign (Mk. 8:11–13; Lk. 11:16, 29). Matthew adds the Sadducees, but it is improbable that this priestly-aristocratic party had any following in Galilee. He omits the sighing of Jesus at the request of a sign from heaven. (This, according to some, differentiates the occasion from the similar one in 12:38.) Instead of refusing it, as in Mark, Jesus says that no sign will be given this generation except that of Jonah, thus drawing on the Q material of 12:39. Matthew thereby makes Jesus hint at his own resurrection, and that explains the injection of the Sadducees in v. 1 (cf. 22:23–33). At the end Jesus departs, but mention of his entering the boat and recrossing the lake (Mk. 8:13) is left out.

Perhaps in order to lessen the close resemblance of this incident to 12:38–39 an interpolation was introduced in vv. 2–3—

a saying with a parallel in Lk. 12:54–56. (Cf. on it there.) It is found in Codices C and D, but is missing in leading manuscripts such as Codices S and B and in the Old Syriac. Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort bracketed it in their text editions, and others have followed this example.

16:5–12 A Discourse on Leaven (Mk. 8:14–21; Lk. 12:1). Matthew makes slight changes in Mark's account. He localizes this incident on the other shore (presupposing a lake crossing not mentioned in 16:4) instead of in the boat and omits that the disciples had one loaf of bread with them. Instead of *warning* of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, Jesus *says* that they should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and *Sadducees.* The disciples, failing to get the point, think that he is referring to their not having taken any bread along. He rebukes them as men of little faith, and asks whether they do not remember the two feeding-miracles. (Does this not show that he can provide bread miraculously if necessary?) He then repeats his utterance and the disciples now realize that the leaven they are to beware of is the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees. This is an interesting example of how the meaning of an anecdote can be totally changed. It is likewise altered by Luke (12:1), but differently. The new emphasis on lack of faith introduced by Matthew in v. 8 lends this story more value for the Christian reader. It is no longer a bygone incident, but becomes symbolic of faith in the Christ who takes care of his own.

16:13–23 The Messianic Confession of Peter; the First Passion Announcement (Mk. 8:27–33; Lk. 9:18–22). Omitting the story of the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida Matthew relates this incident according to Mark, but with minor changes and important additions. Jesus comes to "the parts of Caesarea Philippi" (Mk.: goes out to the villages of Caesarea Philippi). The allusion to "on the way" is left out. In the dialogue Jeremiah or one of the prophets (i.e., an ordinary prophet) is added. More significant is the addition in v. 16 to *Simon* Peter's reply: "(Thou art the Christ) *the Son of the living God.*" This full Christian confession that Jesus is the Son of God (with the extra flourish of "living" before God cf. 2 Kings 19:4) elicits from Jesus the saying in vv. 17–19—one of the most important passages in this Gospel. As Luke does not give it, it is not from Q, but is peculiar to Matthew. It is evidently an addition to the older tradition. One reason for adding it may have been to counteract in advance the bad impression of Peter made by 16:23 ("Get thee behind me Satan").

vv. 17–18 A beatitude is uttered over Peter by Jesus. He solemnly calls him Simon *Bariona* (written as one word, like all the other names in the New Testament that are preceded by Aram. *bar,* "son of"). His father's name then was Jonah, though on the basis of Jn. 1:42; 21:15 f. some think that it was John. (Bariona then would be a miswriting of *Barioanna.*) Jesus holds that Peter received the revelation of his Messiahship not from flesh and blood (including Jesus himself), but directly from God. So he declares to him that he is Peter, and that on this rock Jesus will build his Church and that the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.

Matthew uses "Peter" from the outset (4:18), and so cannot very well make this the actual conferring of a new name. But the story was first told in Aramaic, in which the word for "rock" is *kēphā.* It is the same word on which rests the name "Cephas" (the *s* being a Greek ending), by which Simon was known in his early days at Jerusalem (cf. Gal. 1:18, etc.). The material used here by Matthew originally must have had the purpose of explaining how Jesus gave the name Cephas to Simon. Matthew evidently has no interest in preserving the name Cephas, for to the Church of his day, Simon was *Pétros.* It was attractive to use the latter name here and make a pun on it with Greek *pétra,* "rock." He is *Pétros* and on this *pétra*—the rock that is his person—Jesus will build his Church. When one has seen how freely Matthew can depart from Mark, one will not insist that this was actually spoken by Jesus at the occasion described. It is creative historical writing from the vantage point of the author's time, when Peter's importance.

enhanced by his martyrdom, loomed ever larger. The confessing Peter, who had declared Jesus the Christ *the Son of God,* is the rock on which the Church was founded. We must bear in mind that Peter had been the head of the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian Church, as Paul was the head of the Gentile-Christian Church (Gal. 2:7). It was to this Hellenistic Jewish-Christian Church that the people for whom Matthew wrote belonged. The historical Jesus had no occasion to call Peter "the rock," and it is wholly improbable that he entertained the thought of a Church, for the burden of his message was one of the immediate coming of God's kingdom.

If it is said here of the Church that the gates of Hades (Is. 38:10, a substitute expression for personified death) will not prevail against it, this means that the most deadly peril will not destroy it. The prophecy probably reflects a certain pride over the success of the Church in weathering persecution. It is a question whether the Church for Matthew is anything more than the Jewish Christian one centering (ideally) at Jerusalem.

v. 19 In a further saying, Jesus gives to Peter, as to a sort of major-domo (cf. Is. 22:22, Rev. 3:7), the (bunch of) keys to the kingdom of heaven (= the Church, the kingdom of the Son of man, 13:41) with the power to "bind and loose" on earth (effective in heaven). This is translated Semitic terminology (Aram. *asar,* "he bound"; *sherā* "he loosed"). It could be understood literally as referring to prisoners (cf. Jos., *Ant., 18,* 6, 10, Agrippa bound again). But neither Peter nor the Apostles to whom this is said in 18:15 had such police power. In rabbinic texts the terms are used prominently in two meanings: to indicate that the scribes declare something as forbidden or permitted, or that they pronounce a ban over a person or remove it, i.e., excommunicate and reinstate. The latter meaning fits in 18:18. In 16:19 the language is more general, and indicates that in whatever sphere Peter acts officially he will do so validly—be it as teacher, confessor, or disciplinarian. It seems unlikely that there is any thought as yet of successors to Peter inheriting the right of binding and loosing, whether at Antioch or at Rome. A long-term ecclesiastical view of things is not yet achieved.

v. 20 After this digression of vv. 18–19 Matthew reverts to Mark's conclusion of the Caesarea Philippi incident (8:30), but with slight variations. In charging the disciples (some mss. "commanding"), Jesus specifies what they were not to say to anyone about him (viz., that he was the Christ).

v. 21 Matthew, while still following Mark, makes a more noticeable division here. Instead of saying, "He began to teach them," Matthew has that "from then on" Jesus began to *show* his disciples that which had to be. In this first Passion announcement Matthew adds "going away to Jerusalem," and by omission of the words "and be rejected" makes Jesus suffer at the hands of the hierarchy. He also changes "rising up after three days" to "being raised up on the third day." He omits the remark of Mk. 8:32 about his speaking freely.

vv. 22–23 In the incident of Peter's attempt to rebuke Jesus, Matthew expands Mark's account by quoting Peter as saying, "(May God be) merciful to thee, Lord. Not shall this happen to thee." He omits saying that when Jesus turned about "he looked at his disciples," and softens his "rebuking" Peter to "he said to him." Into this reply Matthew injects a few words explaining what Jesus meant when he called Peter "Satan." "Thou art an offense to me." The assumption is that Satan, figuratively speaking, puts snares in one's path. Peter's desire that Jesus take the royal road of Messiahship is a Satanic temptation for Jesus. Perhaps 4:1 ff. grew out of this.

16:24–28 The Disciples' Path of Suffering (Mk. 8:34–9:1; Lk. 9:23–27). In the saying on discipleship Matthew omits the fresh beginning of Mark with its enlargement of the audience, and instead, with a new introductory formula, has Jesus speak to his disciples. In v. 25 he omits Mark's "for the sake of the gospel" and speaks of "finding" one's life rather than of "saving" it. In v. 27 he alters Mk. 8:38, dropping the first part ("whoever is ashamed of me, etc."), perhaps because he had already adduced a parallel saying in 10:33. He retains the second part, making it a prediction: "The Son of man is about to come in the glory of the Father," but he revises Mark's "with the holy angels" to "with his (the Son of man's) angels." As substitute for the first part he adds, "And then he will give to each one according to his doing" (Gr. *práxis,* i.e., his works; cf. Ps. 62:12).

v. 28 Matthew drops Mark's "and he said to them" and makes this the effective conclusion of the discourse, whereas in Mark it is another saying relevant to the subject. The saying itself is slightly altered; Jesus predicts that some will see the Son of man coming in his kingdom (Mk.: the kingdom of God coming in power). This explains how Son of man and King can be used interchangeably in 25:31–46.

17:1–8 The Transfiguration (Mk. 9:2–8; Lk. 9:28–36). Matthew follows Mark's text with minor differences. He adds the item that John was James' brother (reflecting the greater importance of James). He notes that when Jesus was transfigured "his countenance shone like the sun," and replaces Mark's peculiar description of his garments by saying "they became as white as light." Moses is put ahead of Elijah in the appearance of the two. Peter addresses Jesus as "Lord" instead of as "Rabbi" and says "if thou wilt" in offering to make booths. Matthew omits that Peter did not know what he was saying, and postpones mention of the disciples' being afraid until v. 6. He adds the adjective "bright" to the cloud that overshadowed them. The words of the voice out of the cloud are expanded with "in whom I am well pleased" (cf. 3:17). At this point the fear of the disciples is brought in and made more striking by mention of their falling on their faces. A new element is added in v. 7: Jesus approaches and touches them, bidding them rise and be unafraid. Mark's conclusion is slightly revised. His "when they suddenly looked about" is changed to "when they lifted up their eyes." Mark's final "with them" is left out as superfluous.

In Matthew's version the Transfiguration has become more objective. The divine revelation expressed by the voice from the cloud is the central thing. God's approval of Jesus comes in effectively after Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and after Jesus has announced that he must be put to death at Jerusalem.

17:9–13 Conversation during the Descent from the Mount (Mk. 9:9–13). While descending from the mountain Jesus imposes silence concerning this vision (Gr. *hórama;* Mk.: "what they had seen") until the Son of man is raised up (Mk.: arises) from the dead. Matthew omits the reaction of the disciples as related in Mk. 9:10 and passes on to the question of the scribes (Mk.: Pharisees and scribes) about Elijah. Here he omits the question of Mk. 9:12b about the scriptural prediction concerning the Son of man. In the declaration about Elijah having come he adds "and they did not know him" but leaves out "as is written of him." At the end Matthew says that the disciples now understood that Jesus was speaking about John the Baptist when he said Elijah had already come. Matthew thus has clarified Mark's story for the Christian reader.

17:14–21 The Healing of an Epileptic Boy (Mk. 9:14–29; Lk. 9:37–43a). Matthew simplifies the complicated situation of Mk. 9:14–16. When they reach the crowd a man comes to Jesus and on his knees beseeches him, "Lord, have mercy on my son!" (In Mk. the man addresses Jesus as "teacher" and merely tells his story.) The boy is described as "moonstruck" and suffering badly (Mk.: he had a speechless spirit). Greek medical ideas connected epilepsy with the moon, so we have here influence on Matthew from the Hellenistic environment. Rabbinic sources reflect no knowledge of lunar influence on epilepsy; the epileptic (Heb. *nikpeh*) is "one who is thrown down." According to the father, the boy often *falls* into fire or into water (a thought Mt. draws from Mk. 9:22, where, however, it is said that the (evil) spirit *throws* the boy into fire or water). The man relates that he brought the boy to Jesus' disciples, but that they were unable to heal him (a condensation of Mk. 9:17b–18). Jesus exclaims concerning the unbelieving generation as in Mark (here apparently taken as referring to the disciples)—with addition of an extra adjective, "perverse." He directs that the boy be brought to him. Mark's account of how the boy throws a fit in Jesus' presence and the case history given by the father (Mk. 9:20–24) are omitted. The exorcism description of Mk. 9:25–27 is cut down to a bare statement that Jesus charged him (i.e., the boy) and that the demon (not mentioned until this point in Matthew) went forth from him, so that the boy was healed "from that hour."

vv. 19–21 The most important part of the story for Matthew is its conclusion. The question of the disciples as to why they could not drive out the demon is given as in Mark, but they receive a different answer: on account of their "little faith." (Codex D and Sinaitic Syriac: "unbelief.") The saying about the power of faith which Luke has in 17:5–6 is put here, but with substitution of "mountain" (cf. 21:22 and Mk. 11:22–23) for Luke's sycamore tree, and ending with "and nothing will be impossible to you." Matthew here brings in the thought expressed in the omitted words of Mk. 9:23, "all things are possible to him who believes," applying it to the disciples. In the background stands the fact, still vivid to Matthew, that these men later did mighty works in faith. That was after they had seen the risen Christ, in the manner that the three who had been on the mountain with him, had seen him "metamorphosed" or transfigured. V. 21 is drawn here from Mk. 6:29. It is missing in Codex B and other important authorities.

17:22–23 The Second Passion Announcement (Mk. 9:30–32; Lk. 9:43b–45). Matthew replaces Mk. 9:30–31a with the short remark "when they were gathering (about Jesus) in Galilee" (Codex D: when they were traveling about), he gave this renewed prediction. The latter is as in Mark, but "after three days he will rise" is replaced by "on the third day he will be raised." Matthew cancels the failure of the disciples to understand, and says instead that they were grieved exceedingly.

17:24–27 The Temple Tax. The return to Capernaum is mentioned in dependence on Mk. 9:33, but Matthew here injects a piece of his special material before going on to what Mark then relates. We learn here that there were collectors of the annual tax for the Temple (cf. Ex. 30:11–16). This tax consisted of one-half shekel = the Greek didrachmon, or two-drachma coin and was collectible from every man above the age of twenty. It is said to have been payable in the month before Passover, which would fit very well with Jesus' impending departure for Jerusalem. Peter was approached by the collectors with the question whether their teacher does not pay this coin. (According to Jewish sources priests and rabbis claimed to be free from the obligation of paying it. Since Jesus was a teacher he, too, might claim immunity. To this, one may in part attribute the questioning manner of the tax reminder.) Peter answers, "Yes." He goes into "the house," and Jesus forestalls his speaking by asking him what he thinks (as to this question): From whom do the kings of the earth take toll or tribute—from their sons (i.e., their own people) or from others (i.e., foreign peoples)? (This was the drive behind all ancient imperialisms; the conquerors went tax free while the conquered were oppressively taxed.) On Peter's correct reply Jesus declares that the children then are free from the obligation (i.e., the citizens of God's kingdom ought not to have to pay the Temple tax). But to avoid giving offense Jesus tells Peter to go to the lake, throw in his (line and) hook, take the first fish that rises, and open its mouth, wherein he will find a stater. He is to take that and give it to them on behalf of Jesus and himself. (The Greek coin, stater, was the equivalent of a shekel and thus sufficed to pay for two.) The most unnatural part of the prediction is that the fish will have the stater in its mouth (Gr. *stóma;* one may well ask whether this is not short for *stóma gastrós* "the orifice of the stomach"). Rather oddly the story stops with the saying attributed to Jesus, and does not relate how Peter carried out the command and what astonishment the miraculous procurement of the stater caused. One must suspect that a folk-tale motif has here entered the tradition (cf. the story of the ring of Polycrates, *Herod., 3,* 41 f.). The significance of the episode would be just as great if Jesus had told Peter to pay for both of them (out of his pocket). There may have been special reason to bring up this matter of the Temple tax in Matthew's environment. After the destruction of the Jewish Temple, the Romans took care to collect the Temple tax from the Jews, calling it the *fiscus Judaicus*. What should Jewish Christians do? Should they claim they were not Jews? The decision of Matthew's constituency may have been to pay it, even though not feeling obligated to do so. The anecdote of what Jesus had said to Peter, the great leader of Matthew's Church, may have been helpful.

18:1–5 The Dispute concerning Rank (Mk. 9:33–37; Lk. 9:46–48). Having used the coming to Capernaum in 17:24, Matthew appends this story loosely to the preceding with the stereotype "in that hour." The question of Jesus as to what the disciples had been discussing and the explanation given by Mark are deleted. Instead, Matthew has the disciples come to Jesus and ask, "Who, then, is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" This puts the disciples in a much better light. That Jesus sat down and called the disciples to him, saying that he who would be first should be last, is left out (cf. 20:27). Instead he calls (Mk.: takes) a child, but does not embrace it as in Mark. Feeling that Mk. 9:37 was not sufficiently relevant to the question baldly put in 18:1, Matthew adds an Amen-saying, declaring that unless they repent and become like children they will not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whoever humbles himself (hardly meaning humility in our sense, but becoming lowly, weak, helpless before God) as this child, is the greatest in the kingdom (an adaptation of the saying of Mk. 10:15, which Matthew supplants with a shorter one in his parallel, 19:14b). He concludes the passage with the first half of Mk. 9:37, but with the slight alteration, "whoever receives one such child" (Mk.: "one of these children"). That item, however, is an extra bit of instruction, not relevant to the point raised in 18:1.

18:6–9 About Offenses (Mk. 9:42–48; Lk. 17:1–2)

vv. 6–7 Matthew skips the incident of the strange exorcist. (He has used a saying from it in 10:42.) The next unit in Mark was concerned with the topics of offending "the little ones" (i.e., the Christians) and (by association of ideas) of offending oneself. Matthew takes over the millstone saying of Mk. 9:42 with minor variations, but in v. 7 adds a saying that is related to one in Lk. 17:1 f. about the inevitability of offenses and giving a woe on the person causing them. He revises it, however, by prefixing a more general "woe to the world from (= on account of) the offenses."

vv. 8–9 Matthew combines the sayings on the offenses given one by one's hand or foot, which Mark has separately. The differences from Mark are otherwise minor. He uses "Gehenna" only in the saying on the eye, but instead of quoting Is. 66:24, he says "the Gehenna of fire." In 5:29–30 he has already used the sayings on the offenses of hand and eye in reversed order (from Q).

18:10–14 The Saving of the Lost (Lk. 15:3–7), Q

vv. 10–11 Matthew omits the saying on salt (Mk. 9:49–50) and from here to the end of ch. 18 interpolates other material. The opening warning against despising one of these little ones must originally have applied to children, but Matthew allegorizes it to apply to Christians generally. (Codex D reads "the little ones of those believing.") Their (guardian) angels in heaven at all times are in the immediate presence of God (and so can complain to him at once). Guardian angels are referred to in the Old Testament in Ps. 91:11, Tobit 5:6, 21. Rabbinic texts speak of "the angels of the countenance," an exalted group, second only to the archangels. In 18:11 the received text (cf. A.V.) has the saying: "For the Son of man has come to save the lost" (= Lk. 19:10), but this is missing in such important manuscripts as S and B and in the Old Syriac.

vv. 12–14 With a "What do you think?" the material about the one lost sheep, which is given in Lk. 15:3 ff. as a parable related by Jesus, is adapted to the discourse form. It is abridged, and is fitted into the connection by the statement that it is not the will "before their Father" (cf. "pleasing before thee," 11:26) that one of these "little ones" should perish. Matthew is thinking of the church member that has strayed from the fold.

18:15–20 On Reproving One's Brother (cf. Lk. 17:3)

vv. 15–17 The discourse begun in 18:3 is imagined as continuing. Matthew here contributes special material. The concern is with the Christian who is straying. In the received text (cf. A.V.) the opening words are: "If thy brother sin *against thee,*" but the words "against thee" are not found in the best manuscripts and are clearly out of line with what is at issue here: a moral lapse of some sort (e.g., a violation of the marriage rules of 5:31–32). Three steps are to be taken. The one addressed (presumably then a disciple or his later equivalent, the Christian teacher) is to go and correct him privately (lit. "between you and him," translation of a Semitic phrase). If that does not work, he is to take one or two others along in order that Deut. 19:15 may be applied. If the sinner does not listen to them then, the one addressed is to tell it to the church (Gr. *ekklēsía;* here the congregation, the only other occurrence of this word in the Gospels beside 16:18), and if he does not heed the church he shall be in a class with the Gentile and the publican (a pharisaic type of comparison not in harmony with the spirit of Jesus). This evidently amounts to excommunication; the Jews excommunicated persons from the synagogue on certain grounds, and Christian Church discipline naturally began with adaptation of Jewish ideas.

v. 18 An Amen-saying asserts that those addressed have power "to bind and loose." This power was given exclusively to Peter in 16:19 and perhaps in a broader sense, whereas here it is conferred on all the disciples and in view of what precedes refers to discipline. What is done on earth by the Apostles in this respect is valid in heaven. When this was applied to the acts of bishops in the second century it led to a vast increase in their authority. Its equivalent in 16:19, transferred to Peter's successors, spawned the papacy. It was a fateful legacy of Matthew's Jewish Christianity that was handed down in these passages.

vv. 19–20 An utterance on prayer ends the discourse. Verbal association may have brought it to mind, for here too "on earth" and "in heaven" occur. When two of them on earth are in agreement as to anything which they may seek it will be granted them by their Father in heaven. In the final sentence Jesus speaks as though he had already ascended to heaven: he is invisibly present where two or three gather in his name (cf. Lk. 24:30). (Codex D and Sinaitic Syriac: "For never are two or three gathered in my name with whom I am not in their midst.") "In his name" is really "to his name" (for the idiom, cf. Jer. 3:17, Heb.), i.e., the gathering has its objective in allegiance to him.

18:21–22 On Reconciliation (cf. Lk. 17:4). While the preceding unit had a parallel in Lk. 17:1–3 this one is paralleled in Lk. 17:4. Matthew, however, provides an introduction giving the setting of the saying. Peter asks how often one should forgive one's brother—seven times? That seemed to him sufficient. But Jesus says seventy times seven (cf. Gen. 4:24)—in effect, then, without limit. The saying in Luke, it should be noted, differs considerably. The form it has in Matthew is more severe.

18:23–35 Parable of the Unmerciful Servant. To drive home the matter of forgiving one's brother, Matthew continues Jesus' discourse with a parable from his special material. It begins with the "may be compared" formula (cf. on 13:24), and the subject of the comparison is the kingdom of the heavens. As in the previous instances (excepting 13:52) the story as a whole illustrates an aspect of the kingdom. "A man, a king" (possibly "king" is an interpretative addition) wished to settle accounts (cf. 25:19) with his servants (slaves). When he began this accounting, a debtor of ten thousand talents was brought to him. (It seems doubtful that this immense sum is original; ten talents would still be a lot of money, counting six thousand denarii to the talent; the original sum may have been multiplied by Matthew to suit the interpretation of the man as a king and of the "servant" as a high official or a steward of crown properties. Slaves often attained very high office, since their loyalty could be relied on more than that of free men.) As the debtor was unable to pay, the king commanded him and his family and possessions to be sold to pay the debt. (It is unthinkable that the proceeds could produce such a sum as the one mentioned. This supports the idea that the sum originally envisioned was much smaller and that ordinary master-slave relations were involved.) When he fell down before his master pleading for patience and promising that he would pay everything, "the lord (owner) of the servant" was moved to sympathy, released him, and even canceled the debt. Going forth, this servant found a certain one of his fellow servants who owed him one hundred denarii. He seized the man and choked him, demanding payment. The fellow servant pleaded for patience and promised to pay everything. But the first servant refused and cast him into prison (to stay there) until he paid what he owed. (This is not plausible from the angle of ancient slavery laws—one slave could not imprison another—but the story interest makes the reader oblivious to the difficulty. It is of little help to make the fellow servant a subordinate who was similarly slow in collecting taxes in his district.) The other fellow servants were exceedingly grieved and reported the matter to their master, who holds up to him the mercy he received and his own lack of mercy, and then in wrath delivers him to the "torturers" (hint of the Gehenna; cf. 5:29–30) until he pays all he owes him. Thus Jesus' heavenly Father will do to them if they do not forgive their brothers from their hearts. That is the way God reigns. The parable is an illustration of the Beatitude "Blessed are the merciful" (5:7), and fittingly concludes the ministry of Jesus in Galilee.

PART II THE JUDAEAN PERIOD

19:1–27:66 (Mk. 10–15; Lk. 18:15–23:56

A. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

19:1–20:34 (Mk. 10; Lk. 18:15–19:27)

19:1–12 Marriage and Divorce (Mk. 10:1–12)

vv. 1–2 Matthew uses different phraseology, but follows Mark in substance. After Jesus had finished these words he went to "the territory of Judaea (on) the other side of the Jordan" (Mk.: the territory of Judaea *and* the other side of the Jordan).

vv. 3–9 As in Mark, Pharisees come to Jesus to tempt him with a question on divorce. (Cf. already 5:32; Lk. 16:18.) In Mark the question was whether it was lawful to divorce a wife; Matthew adds "for any reason?" The dialogue of Mk. 10:3–5 is omitted here but is made use of below. Jesus replies with the reference to Gen. 1:27 and 2:24, giving the latter more fully and capping it as Mark did with "what God has joined, etc." Matthew then brings in what was omitted above. The Pharisees ask why then did Moses speak Deut. 24:1, where he commanded to give a woman a bill of divorce and dismiss her? (In Mk. this was a point of information Jesus elicited from the Pharisees at the outset.) Jesus gives the same reply as in Mk. 10:5, but with the additional remark, "from the beginning (creation) it was not thus." This position is then softened in a further rule given directly to the Pharisees, and not, as in Mark, as private instruction for the disciples. According to Matthew he who dismisses his wife *except for fornication* (= adultery) and weds another thereby commits adultery. (Mk. did not have the exception and had an additional rule for the event of a woman's divorcing the man.) Such diversities show how the Church had to make concessions, and that the Christian ruling was in flux.

vv. 10–12 Matthew then brings in a dialogue with the disciples to replace the one of Mk. 10:10, but without particularly stressing that it took place privately. The disciples make the pessimistic comment that if the legal relation between a man and his wife be of such a nature it is not advantageous to marry. Jesus does not refute this, as one might expect him to do, in view of the fact that the purpose of vv. 1–8 was to exalt marriage. It thus seems probable that the saying that follows has been artificially put into the present connection by Matthew. Jesus declares that not all can comprehend this word (that of the disciples in v. 10? or the one he is about to give them?), but only they to whom it is given (by God; cf. 20:23). (For) there are eunuchs who were born as such and others who were made such by men, and there are eunuchs who have castrated themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let him who can understand it do so! As castration (much practiced by heathen in Hellenistic-Roman Syria, especially at Hierapolis; cf. Lucian's *Syrian Goddess*) was forbidden in Deut. 23:1 it seems unlikely that Jesus was recommending it (as the Church father, Origen, who castrated himself because of this saying, supposed). The saying must rather be regarded as hyperbolic, as in the case of cutting off a hand or plucking out an eye (5:29–30). What Jesus means is that there is such a thing as the complete extirpation of sexuality from life on the part of those wholly dedicated to the imminent coming of God's kingdom. His own example was an illustration of it. The apocryphal Apostolic Acts show that this thought had a far-reaching influence. The avoidance of marriage, however, is not made a requirement here. Cf. 1 Cor. 7:25 ff.

19:13–15 Jesus and the Children (Mk. 10:13–16; Lk. 18:15–17). Children were brought to Jesus that he might lay hands on them and pray (this elucidates Mark's "touch them"). The change from Mark's active to the passive has the seeming consequence that Jesus rebukes the children. (The R.S.V. corrects to "rebukes the people.") Matthew omits mention of Jesus' displeasure as well as his taking the children into his arms (cf. 18:2 ff. and Mk. 9:36 ff.). The saying of Mk. 10:15 is left out since an equivalent was given in 18:3. Jesus departs at the end of this incident rather than at the beginning of the next one as in Mark.

19:16–30 On the Peril of Wealth (Mk. 10:17–31; Lk. 18:18–30)

vv. 16–22 Matthew omits Mark's situation-description. Starting with "behold," in Hebraic style he relates that a certain individual approached Jesus, asking what good he must do to have eternal life (Mk.: what he must do to inherit it). He does not address Jesus as "Good Teacher." Jesus' response is altered to why does he ask him about what is good? One there is who is good (logically Matthew ought to have changed this to one *thing* there is which is good). To the Commandments cited in Mark, Matthew adds Lev. 19:18. While the reading is well attested it could be an addition; it is omitted in the Palestinian Syriac version. In v. 20 the "certain one" is a young man. He affirms that he has kept all these Commandments ("from my youth" is left out), and asks what he still lacks (Mk.: Jesus tells him he still lacks one thing). That Jesus looked at him and loved him is not taken over by Matthew. The youth is told that if he would be *perfect* he should give all to the poor and have a treasure in heaven. Then he should follow Jesus (as his disciple). In the conclusion the Marcan words "his countenance fell" are dropped.

vv. 23–26 The sequel is slightly changed and condensed by Matthew in comparison with Mk. 10:23 ff. He omits the vivid touch of Jesus' looking about at his disciples, and in place of the exclamatory saying about those having possessions he has an Amen-saying declaring that a rich man will enter the kingdom only with difficulty. The astonishment of the disciples is omitted as well as the repetition of the Saying. With "again I say unto you" Matthew brings in Mk. 10:25–26 with insignificant differences.

vv. 27–30 In Mark this could have been a separate incident; Matthew, however, joins it closely to the preceding by his "then Peter answered." The words of Peter are supplemented in Matthew by the direct question: "What then shall we have (as recompense)?" In the reply of Jesus, Matthew adds new material in v. 28 before rejoining Mark. He speaks of the regeneration (Gr. *palingenesía* or rebirth—a word that originated in Pythagoraean and Stoic thought; it is used in Jos., *Ant., 11,* 3, 9 for the postexilic restoration, and here for the Messianic Age). In this regeneration, then, when the *Son* of man sits on the throne of his glory, the disciples will sit on twelve thrones judging (= governing, Hebraism) the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Lk. 22:30). The Messianic king has his gubernatorial appointees (cf. Solomon, 1 Kings 4:7 ff.). The saying stays within the sphere of Hebrew Messianism.

Rather incongruous with this is the continuation based on Mk. 10:29–31 (with omission of most of v. 30). Here the thought is of inheriting eternal life, involving manifold (Mk.: hundredfold) recompense for those leaving everything for his sake. As in 16:25 Matthew omits Mark's "and for the sake of the gospel," and likewise the allusion to the coming world age. He keeps Mark's concluding Saying about many "first" being "last" (given and applied differently in Lk. 13:30), and repeats it at the end of the next piece (20:16). It is thus his purpose to make the parable prove this point. (That, however, may not be the purpose for which the parable was actually related.)

20:1–16 Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. This striking parable, which is closely joined to the preceding by "for," begins with the "is like" formula (cf. 13:31) and seeks in its entirety to say something illustrative of the nature of the kingdom. It tells of a householder (the Gr. word translates Heb. "lord of the house") who goes forth early to employ day laborers. (As the working day was from sunrise to the appearance of the stars, he had to set forth very early.) He hires the available men for a denarius a day (cf. Tob. 5:14). It is not clear why the householder has to go out repeatedly at the third, sixth, ninth and eleventh hours, and how he can find a labor supply that was not present earlier; this is apparently just dictated by what the speaker of the parable wants to illustrate. The eleventh-hour laborers declare that they stand idle because no one has hired them. (Jesus here shows sympathy for the unemployed.) The householder in engaging them reserves the right to pay them what he considers equitable; the amount they can expect is too small to make it worthwhile to discuss. At pay time the steward (who must not be allegorized as Christ) is instructed to give all the same pay, beginning with those hired last and ending with those hired first. (This statement probably led Matthew to use the parable for the point made in v. 16.) The latter thus are forced to see those who had worked only one, three, six or nine hours receiving the same pay as those who had put in twelve hours. This causes discontent on their part. Their protest, however, is an undue invasion of the sovereign right of the owner. He has done them no wrong; they had agreed to their day's pay and had received it. He asks the spokesman of the discontented: "Is thine eye evil (= are you jealous, cf. Prov. 23:6 Heb.) because I am good?" (= kind; cf. Ps. 25:8; or short for "of a good eye" = of kindly inclination; cf. Prov. 22:9, Heb.).

The point of the parable is the wondrous goodness of the householder (= God), who gives those that worked only the shorter hours the same pay, and rejects the grumbling of the others. The parable is akin to that of the prodigal son, where the elder brother is jealous, as the first laborers are here. Jesus must originally have spoken this parable to the Pharisees to defend the view that converted sinners have the same standing before God as the righteous because of the greatness of his mercy. By adding "So the last will be first, and the first last" (= 19:30 with the order reversed) Matthew applies the parable to convey to the disciples a warning, viz., that their having followed Jesus earlier than others does not guarantee that they will be among the first when the final reward is distributed. (The received text adds in v. 16 "many are called but few are chosen." This is missing in the best manuscripts and is derived from 22:14. Someone evidently felt that this was the key to the interpretation of the parable; he took it to be a warning that those who murmured against God, as did the laborers of v. 11, thereby lost their election.)

20:17–19 The Third Passion Announcement (Mk. 10:32–34; Lk. 18:31–34). Matthew replaces Mk. 10:32, since that was in part obscure and difficult, and merely notes that when Jesus went up to Jerusalem he spoke to the disciples privately. But he then follows Mark with only minor differences. The delivering to the Gentiles is for the purpose of mockery, etc. (In Mk. the Gentiles do this on their own impulse.) Matthew omits "the spitting," replaces "killing" with "crucified" and as usual, except for 12:40, says that "he will be raised on the third day" instead of "will rise after three days."

20:20–28 Jesus and the Sons of Zebedee (Mk. 10:35–45)

vv. 20–25 An interesting change is

made here; Mark's story speaks of a request of the sons of Zebedee. Matthew describes their *mother* as coming with the sons and as falling down before Jesus to plead for them. Everyone can understand and forgive a mother's ambition for her sons. The answer of Jesus, however, is given to the brothers, and the anger of the other disciples is directed against them. This clearly shows that she has been secondarily brought into the story to lessen the bad impression it made. The mother of the sons of Zebedee went along to Jerusalem according to Mt. 27:56 (but is not mentioned in Mk. 15:40). Luke leaves out the incident entirely. In the question of Jesus the allusions to "baptism" are omitted and at the end "prepared" is supplemented with "by my father."

vv. 24–28 The variations from Mark's text are slight. Matthew cuts out that the ten "began to be indignant" (suggesting that this situation was of a long, drawn-out nature). He simplifies the phrase "the ones seeming to rule over the Gentiles" to "those ruling over the Gentiles." The one of them who wants to be first is directed to be their servant (Mk.: the servant of *all*). The statement about the Son of man's ministering is introduced by "just as" instead of by "for." At the conclusion of this passage Codex D, the Old Syriac, and others have an addition beginning with the interesting saying, "But seek ye to increase from that which is small and to become less from that which is greater." (The rest of the addition is similar to Lk. 14:8–10.)

20:29–34 The Healing of the Blind Men at Jericho (Mk. 10:46–52; Lk. 18:35–43). Matthew omits mention of the arrival at Jericho. Mark's Bartimaeus becomes anonymous, loses the beggar status and gains a colleague (like the Gerasene demoniac, 8:28; Mk. 5:2). Jesus summons the blind men directly—not through intermediaries. They address Jesus as Lord (instead of as Rabbouneí). His pity for them is mentioned, and in healing them he lays his hands on their eyes (as in Mk. 8:25). Rather strangely Matthew, who otherwise stresses faith where Mark does not do so, omits Mark's "thy faith has saved thee." He makes their "following" Jesus symbolical by omitting the final "on the way."

B. THE DAYS IN JERUSALEM

21:1–25:46

(Mk. 11–13; Lk. 19:28–21:38)

21:1–9 The Entry into Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1–10; Lk. 19:28–38). Matthew follows Mark with a few important changes. The village at the Mount of Olives to which Jesus comes is Bethphage, east of the summit, not the more southerly Bethany. In dispatching the two disciples he predicts that they will find a she-ass tethered there and her foal with her. (Mark spoke only of a foal, meaning a colt; cf. on that passage.) The direct question of an objector to their taking them is changed to "if anyone says anything to you." Matthew sees what is now being undertaken as fulfilling Zech. 9:9, which he solemnly quotes (in a text not conforming exactly to the LXX). Thereby the light of prophecy is focused on what follows and it is this that has made Matthew's version of the text the favorite one. The Greek-speaking formulator of the narrative did not understand the principle of parallelism in Semitic poetry (for a similar error, cf. Jn. 19:24), and wrongly interprets the prophecy as meaning two animals instead of one. This led him to change Mark's "colt on which no one yet has ridden" to ass and foal.

Matthew reports that the disciples did as they were commanded; he thus can skip the circumstantial account of what happened, as given in Mk. 11:4–6. They led the ass and foal (to Jesus) and placed "the garments" upon them (Mk. threw their garments on it), and he sat above (Gr. *epánō*) them (hardly meaning the garments, as Origen thought, but the animals. Matthew is not much concerned about how the thing was carried out practically, but is bent only on doing justice to the prophecy). The Old Syriac translator has "and Jesus rode upon them," which likewise leaves unanswered the question on which animal Jesus sat. Since Matthew eliminated the allusion of Mk. 11:2 "on which no one had yet ridden" he may have thought of Jesus as riding on the ass, not on the foal. While the underlying Hebrew word (*'ayir*) in Zechariah is used for a young ass that can be ridden, Matthew imagines the animal as so young that it will not leave its mother, and hence no doubt as too weak to carry a grown man. Whereas Mark speaks of "many," Matthew speaks of "a crowd" or "crowds." In Mark they cut bunches of foliage from the fields to strew in the road; in Matthew they cut branches from the trees. As the Mount of Olives was presumably covered on the west with an olive orchard, the branches would be olive branches, the cutting of which would scarcely have been tolerated in a community for which these trees were so important. Matthew injects after the first "Hosanna" the words "to the Son of David," for he is going to omit Mk. 11:10—except for its final "Hosanna in the highest." It is Matthew's intention to represent the acclaim here given Jesus as prophetic of that which he will receive when he returns as Messiah after the Passion and resurrection (cf. 23:39).

21:10–17 Jesus in the Temple (its Cleansing); Return to Bethany (Mk. 11:11, 15–19; Lk. 19:45–46)

vv. 10–11 Matthew elaborates on the arrival at the city. At Jesus' entry the whole city was shaken, saying, "Who is this?" The crowds (that had come with Jesus) say, "The prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee." It is surprising that the claim made for Jesus is so modest (cf. 21:46; Lk. 24:19). That must be intentional, for the story has to be told in such a way that no blame attached to Jesus' followers for proclaiming him as Messiah. That there is an inconsistency between this moderation and hailing him as "son of David" was not apparent to Matthew.

vv. 12–13 Matthew has Jesus enter "the Temple of God," but departs from Mark in introducing the cleansing here, which Mark defers to the following day. He repeats verbatim the account Mark had given of this event except that he omits Mk. 11:16 (forbidding transit through the Temple) and does not introduce the scriptural quotation with "he taught." In the quotation he omits the words "to all peoples." Mark's sequel (Mk. 11:18–19, appropriately giving the reaction of the authorities to the cleansing of the Temple) is replaced with what follows.

vv. 14–16 Matthew introduces supplementary material here. First: lame and blind persons come to Jesus in the Temple and he heals them. This links up with 2 Sam. 5:8. It injects an idea of miracle-doing at Jerusalem, which is foreign to both Mark and Luke. Second: acclaim by children, continuing the demonstration of 21:9 and crying, "Osanna to the son of David." This is introduced rather peculiarly. Matthew speaks of the high priests and scribes seeing the miracles Jesus did and seeing this action of the children. They were displeased, and (without allusion to the miracles) ask Jesus whether he does not hear what these (i.e., the children) were saying? (He should stop them.) He replies with a counterquestion: whether they have never read Ps. 8:3 (construed as a prophecy). Luke 19:39–40 has a very different version of this story.

v. 17 Regaining the standpoint of the last words of Mk. 11:11, Matthew mentions the departure for Bethany, adding that Jesus lodged there overnight. As Bethphage was the starting point in 21:1, one would expect it to have been named here. Such a small matter as the return of the ass and foal to their owner does not trouble the narrator.

21:18–19 The Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mk. 11:12–14). Mark put this item before the cleansing of the Temple. Matthew in placing it after that event can connect it directly with the next piece. Mention of Bethany is omitted. Jesus does not see a fig tree "from afar," as in Mark, but sees one (Semitism for "a") fig tree at the road (-side). He goes to it and does not find on it a single leaf (Mk.: it had only leaves). Mark's explanation about it not being the time of figs is left out. Jesus here says the same thing as in Mk. 11:14, but Matthew then reports the immediate withering of the fig tree (which if it had no leaf seems difficult to understand).

21:20–22 The Conversation about the Withered Fig Tree (Mk. 11:20–25). In Mark the leaved-out tree had withered when they passed it again the following morning and this led to a remark by Peter. In Matthew its immediate withering produces surprise on the part of the disciples, who ask, "How did the fig tree wither at once?" The short reply of Jesus in Mk. 11:22, "Have faith in God," is left out, but the attached Amen-saying is reworded to include its substance in conditional form: If they have faith and do not doubt they will not only do the thing done to the fig tree, but will say to this mountain that it should be taken up and cast in the sea and it would happen. Having used the idea of "not doubting" here, Matthew can omit this element in v. 21 (cf. Mk. 11:23b). The saying on answer to prayer made in faith (Mk. 11:24) is taken over by Matthew, but without the introductory "therefore I say unto you." The continuation, Mk. 11:25, is omitted by Matthew (cf. 6:14).

21:23–27 The Question about Authority (Mk. 11:27–33; Lk. 20:1–8). Simplifying and revising Mark, Matthew has Jesus come to the Temple, and while teaching he is approached by high priests and "elders of the people" (omitting the scribes). The question of Mk. 11:28 now applies to his authority for teaching (cf. Mk. 1:22, 27), whereas in Mark it was a belated reaction to the cleansing of the Temple. From v. 24 on Mark is followed almost verbatim: If they will answer his question on John the Baptist's authority he will answer theirs.

21:28–32 Parable of the Two Sons. This is introduced with "what do you think?" (cf. 18:12; 22:42; 26:66). The short parable which Jesus then relates is from Matthew's special material. It tells of a man who had two sons. He went to one of them with the request that he work that day in the vineyard. The son refused, but later changed his mind and did what was asked of him. The father went to the other son with the same request, and that son consented, but did not act on his promise. (The change of order in some manuscripts is unconvincing, as a refusal by the first gives a good reason for asking the second.) Which, Jesus asks, fulfilled the will of the father? The answer given by the audience is: the first. (In the texts changing the order it is "the latter" or "the last.") This is followed by an Amen-saying that the publicans and harlots will enter the kingdom before *they* will (in the present connection: the high priests, etc.; cf. v. 23). This material, however, evidently is put here editorially by Matthew. It belongs in the general situation described in 9:10–13. The persons addressed must thus have been the Pharisees. The point of the parable is that *they* are like the son who did not fulfill his promise, while the despised publicans and harlots have repented of their disobedience and now do God's will. It is noteworthy that what is *done* is more important in the eyes of Jesus than what is *said*. The initial disobedient attitude of the one son is not held against him. On the formal side, a rabbinic parable provides an interesting parallel. A king seeks to let a field; four men to whom he offers it decline, the fifth accepts but leaves it unploughed. Question: Against whom will the king be most incensed?

v. 32 To the parable of the two sons is added an item about John the Baptist, with which Lk. 7:29–30 has a partial affinity. John came to them (in Matthew's intention those of v. 23; originally the Pharisees) "in (= with) the way of righteousness" (cf. 2 Pet. 2:21)—evidently a higher righteousness than that of the Pharisees, 5:20—but they did not believe (in his authority); the publicans and harlots did believe, but they (the Pharisees?) did not subsequently reconsider and believe. The presence of this saying here may be due to the key words: "John" in v. 25 and "publicans and harlots" in v. 31. In its present context this saying becomes a historical illustration of the parable. However, it is only artificially adapted to this purpose. The high priests, scribes and elders do not naturally invite a contrast with publicans and harlots. Only when this material is taken separately can its original intent be understood.

21:33–46 Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk. 12:1–12; Lk. 20:9–19). Mark begins the parable-speaking here, while Matthew has Jesus say, "Hear another parable." He rewords Mark's opening sentence and characterizes the man of the parable as a householder. Instead of sending individuals in succession, the last of whom is the son, the man has three servants go out the first time, and thus can describe how each was treated differently: one they beat, one they killed, one they stoned (Matthew is thinking of the prophets). The second group is "more (numerous) than the first." Imagination here deserts Matthew; he can say only that they were dealt with in the same manner. Lastly the householder sends his son. (In making him third Matthew is more original than Mark who, with his mind on allegorization, had artificially introduced into the parable a third messenger who is killed and then many others, of whom some were killed and others beaten.) The adjective "beloved" did not fit well with the changed sentence and so was omitted. The story continues as in Mark, except that an important change is made in v. 39: the son is cast out of the vineyard and killed (in Mk. 12:8, killed and then cast out of the vineyard). In Mark, Jesus asks what the lord of the vineyard will do, and then answers the question himself. In Matthew the hearers give the answer to the question. The beginning of it originally must have read as in the Old Syriac "He will miserably destroy them" (omitting "the miserable ones," or "wretches"). That the new husbandmen will pay the owner the fruits in their season rounds out the statement. In Mark the quotation of the "cornerstone" prophecy (Ps. 118:22–23) was added directly; Matthew introduces it with a separate formula: "Jesus said to them."

vv. 43–44 Matthew expands the remark of Mk. 12:9 that the vineyard will be given to others by saying that the kingdom will be taken away from them (i.e., the Jewish people) and given to a people bearing its fruits (not as one would expect: delivering its fruits). The thought is not of Gentiles, however, but of the Christian community as the people of God. Leading manuscripts here have a v. 44 (= Lk. 22:18) elaborating on the cornerstone saying; it is missing in Codex D, the best Old Latin texts and the Sinaitic Syriac, and obviously comes in belatedly; it should have stood before v. 43. Its wrong placement suggests that it was originally a marginal note.

vv. 45–46 The high priests and Pharisees now are identified as the hearers whom Jesus had addressed. Their hostility is mentioned. In explaining why they could not act against Jesus, Matthew says that the people held him "unto a prophet" (i.e., as a prophet—an Aramaism which was not used in v. 26, where the Old Syriac also has it). Matthew omits the departure of the hearers. He needs them for the next parable.

22:1–14 Parable of the Marriage Feast (cf. Lk. 14:16–24), Q. After a suitable closing remark, such as 21:46, one expects no further parable. The fresh introductory statement, "And answering, Jesus spoke to them again in parables," suggests that what follows was added editorially by the author. One now expects more than one parable. The single one given is found in more original form in Luke, who must have derived it from Q. In the form in which it appears here it has been changed considerably by being subjected to allegorization.

The parable begins with the "may be compared" formula (cf. on 13:24). The story as a whole illustrates something concerning the kingdom. The certain man of Q is changed into a king, since he represents God. The great banquet becomes a marriage feast, which the king arranges for his son. (In Aram. the word for banquet is also used for marriage feast, so the transition was readily made.) He sent out his servants (Lk.: a servant) to invite the previously bidden guests a second time, as Oriental custom dictated. They did not want to come. Other servants were sent out (this is not the case in Lk.) to describe the elaborate preparations made and to urge them to attend. But those invited paid no attention, one going to his field, one to his place of business (a faint echo of Lk. 14:18–20, Q), while the rest seized the servants, mistreated and killed them. *The king was angry and sending out his armies destroyed those murderers and burned their city.* (The allegorical veneer is very thin here; it is obvious that the servants are the prophets and Apostles and that the city is Jerusalem, the fall of which in A.D. 70 is presupposed.) Addressing his servants, the king declares that the marriage feast is ready, but that those invited were not worthy. He sends them out to the road crossings with the instruction to invite whomever they find. (In Lk. the single servant is sent to the streets and alleys.) They brought together those they found, *both bad and good,* and the hall was filled with guests. (In Lk. the man finds that there is still room and sends the servants out a second time to roads and hedges. In this instance Lk. has probably expanded Q.)

The parable originally ended here—but not as effectively as Luke's version in Lk. 14:24. It seems quite clear, too, that the italicized material of vv. 6–7 represents expansion within the parable under the influence of the parable of the wicked husbandmen. The phrase of v. 10, *"both bad and good,"* was injected to prepare the way for vv. 11–14; but it diverts the mind from the real point. The parable was originally concerned only with teaching that since the Pharisees and other leaders of the Jewish people disdain to heed the message of the kingdom, God is inviting those from the crossroads. An extension to include the Gentiles could also be made easily (cf. Luke's version). But Matthew is greatly concerned with the presence of evil within the Christian fold, and to strike at this he expanded the parable by attaching vv. 11 ff.

vv. 11–14 This material, which is not found in Luke's version, is apparently a fragment of a different parable also dealing with a marriage feast. An individual not suitably arrayed for the occasion is discovered in the assembly. (That this fits but poorly with guests gathered from the crossroads, v. 10, is obvious and reveals the artificiality of the combination.) The king addresses him kindly as "friend" and asks him how he came in (i.e., presumed to come in) without being suitably attired. The man is silent—an admission of his guilt. (He was a "gate crasher.") The king commands his servants (Gr. *diákonoi*) to bind his hands and feet (Codex D and Old Syriac: to seize him by hands and feet) and cast him into the darkness outside. The clause, "where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth," belongs to the application: as the man was cast out, so will the kind of person symbolized by him be cast into Gehenna. That few are chosen (v. 16) fits with this concluding piece; those called are not the invited ones of 22:3, 4.

Jesus' concern in vv. 11–14 was clearly with fitness and unfitness for participation in the kingdom of God. The suitable garment is symbolical of something, perhaps repentance (cf. the different figure for it used in 3:8 by the Baptist). Through fusion of this material with the parable of the marriage feast, the latter was made particularly meaningful for Christian readers.

22:15–22 The Question of the Pharisees (Mk. 12:13–17; Lk. 20:20–26). In Mk. 12:12 the adversaries of 11:27 (high priests, scribes, and elders) have departed, and now send some of the Pharisees and Herodians. Matthew, having introduced the Pharisees in 21:45, makes them go and take counsel as to how they might ensnare Jesus "in a word" (i.e., an utterance that could be used against him). Since they cannot very well send themselves, Matthew has them send their disciples (cf. Mk. 2:18) "with the Herodians." The words with which they address Jesus in Mk. 12:14 are rearranged so that his teaching the way of God in truth is joined with "thou art true." Matthew adds the request that Jesus tell them what he thinks, before introducing their question about the tax. He omits the words: "shall we give or not give?" Instead of Jesus' "seeing their hypocrisy" he here discerns their wickedness, but "you hypocrites" is added to his direct question. For the request to bring Jesus a denarius, Matthew substitutes the statement that they should show him the tax coin, whereupon they bring a denarius. The basic saying of Jesus on rendering to Caesar is given with no change of meaning. Matthew adds that the interrogators departed (actually his counterpart to Mk. 12:12).

22:23–33 The Question of the Sadducees (Mk. 12:18–27; Lk. 20:27–40). Matthew places this interview and the preceding one on the same day. Moses is quoted as "saying" (rather than as having written for them). The quotation of Deut. 25:5 is given in shorter form than in Mark and shows some influence from Gen. 38:8, LXX. In Mark the statement "there were seven brothers" could be taken as fictional; Matthew makes it factual: "there were *among us* seven brothers." Matthew puts Mk. 12:20 differently, and has the childless man *leave* his wife to his brother. He abridges the further happenings of Mk. 12:21–22a. The question of Jesus in Mk. 12:24 is turned into a positive statement:

"You are wrong, for you know not the Scriptures." In bringing in the quotation of Ex. 3:6 Mark's reference to the thornbush (story) is left out. His final "you are greatly mistaken" is also dropped, but a verse is added about the crowds hearing and being astonished at the teaching of Jesus.

22:34–40 The Question about the Greatest Commandment (Mk. 12:28–34; Lk. 10:25–28). In Mark one of the scribes comes to Jesus, in friendly manner, having heard Jesus' fine reply to the Sadducees. Matthew makes the Pharisees gather unto Jesus in unfriendly purpose on hearing about his silencing the Sadducees. One of them, a "lawyer" (Gr. *nomikós*), tempts Jesus to a reply that might expose him to criticism. He asks what is the greatest Commandment in the Law (Mk.: what Commandment is first of all?). As in Mark, Jesus quotes Deut. 6:5 (but leaving out v. 4). Matthew underlines the fact that this is "the greatest and first commandment." The commandment of Lev. 19:18 is introduced solemnly with "the second is like unto it." For Mark's final "greater than these is no other Commandment" Matthew substitutes the observation: "On these two Commandments hang (as on a hook) the whole Law and the Prophets" (i.e., they can be deduced from them; cf. a third-century rabbi's question: What is the smallest Scripture section, Heb. *pārāshāh,* on which hang the chief matters of the law? The answer was Prov. 3:6). Having represented the interrogator as tempting Jesus, Matthew can have no use for the conclusion of Mark's story (Mk. 12:32–34). He evidently cannot conceive of a Jewish teacher who is anything but hostile to Jesus (reflecting the tension between Jews and Christians in his day).

22:41–46 The Son of David (Mk. 12:35–37; Lk. 20:41–44). Since Matthew has the Pharisees assembled he has Jesus address to them rather than to the general public his question: "What think ye about the Christ (= the Messiah), whose Son is he? (In Mk., Jesus asks a rhetorical question: "How can the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David?") On receiving their reply he asks them how does David "in the Spirit" call him "Lord" in uttering Ps. 110:1. (Mk.: David himself says in the Holy Spirit.) In v. 45 the statement of Mk. 12:37a is changed in form ("If David calls him Lord, etc."), but not in substance. Mark's comment that the people heard Jesus gladly is replaced with: "No one was able to answer him a word," and with the final statement of the omitted part of the previous anecdote, Mk. 12:34b: "No one dared ask him." For Matthew the thought evidently is that the Messiah who is to come and who to him is the risen Jesus is more than the son of David. The title "Lord" (Gr. *kýrios*) applies to him in his heavenly state. That he was the son of David in the days of the flesh is not denied, but where affirmed it is dogma (cf. 9:27, etc.; Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8).

23:1–36 Discourse against Pharisaism (Mk. 12:38–40; Lk. 20:45; 11:46; 20:46; 11:52; 20:47).

Mark merely mentions that in teaching (in the Temple) Jesus spoke the utterance that then follows. Matthew has him address the crowds and his disciples (the latter with an eye to the inclusion of vv. 8–12) right after the preceding incident. It is a major discourse in Matthew, and has been built up by augmenting the Marcan sayings with Q material and some of Matthew's special material as well as with material already used in the Sermon on the Mount.

vv. 2–7 The discourse starts with special material of Matthew. Jesus asserts that the scribes and the Pharisees (actually he means Pharisaic scribes) sit on the chair of Moses. (This is not just a newly coined figure of speech but an allusion to an honorary seat provided in synagogues for a scribe who might be present. Such a seat, carved out of stone and bearing a commemorative Hebrew inscription, survives at the ruins of the third-century A.D. synagogue of Chorazin.) Jesus urges doing what they say, but not doing according to their example. The first part of that statement need not be taken too seriously because the emphasis lies on the second part. He speaks of the burden they impose (cf. Lk. 11:46), accuses them of doing good works in order to attract notice; satirizes their making wide (i.e., impressive looking) their phylacteries (i.e., the capsules containing the parchments with the Shema confession, which were worn at morning prayers; cf. Ex. 13:9, 16; Deut. 6:8; 11:18), and making long the fringes on the hems of their robes (as marks of dignity). Here the saying impinges on Mk. 12:38, which mentioned their liking to walk about in long robes (Gr. *stolē*). He then parallels Mk. 12:38–39 in the other things he mentions, but changes the order of the items: they love first place at banquets, first seats in synagogues, greetings in the market places. Matthew adds that they love to be called "rabbi" by men.

vv. 8–12 Having satirized the Pharisaic scribes Jesus addresses his disciples. They shall not call themselves "rabbi," for one is their teacher (God) and they are all brothers. They shall call no one but the heavenly one "Father"; they shall not be called "masters" (Gr. *kathēgētēs*), for one is their master: Christ. (This is not the title "Master" used in Lk. 5:5, etc.) By way of driving home the lesson of humility Matthew in v. 11 quotes a saying about him who would be greatest being the servant of all (cf. 20:26) and another about exalting oneself (cf. Lk. 14:11; 18:14).

vv. 13–33 The "woes over the scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," now follow. They are partly special material and partly from Q. Matthew left out the woes following the Q beatitudes (Lk. 6:24–26), reserving that literary form for this polemic against the arch opponents of Jesus. The woes were originally seven in number, just as were the Beatitudes of ch. 5. They are put in the second person and each contains a supporting accusation. These accusations are:

1. **v. 13** They close (the door of) the kingdom of heaven before the people; they cannot get in themselves and will not let those who desire to do so go in (cf. Lk. 11:52). The saying reflects conditions of Matthew's day, when the rabbis were forbidding Jews to join the Christian sect. (At this point, v. 14, the received text has an extra woe which is not found in the best manuscripts; it is an interpolation based on Mk. 12:40).

2. **v. 15** They spare no effort to make proselytes, but turn such converts into sons of Gehenna worse than they themselves. The first remark is important historically, for there is no knowledge of such Jewish missionary zeal. The second suggests that the Church of Matthew's time found some of its most fanatic Jewish opponents in proselytes).

3. **vv. 16–22** They pervert what is right, as exemplified by their casuistry concerning oaths.

4. **vv. 23–24** They even tithe mint, dill and cummin (the Talmud gives no evidence for the tithing of mint), but neglect emphasis on the great things, justice, mercy and faithfulness. The proper principle is: Do the latter and do not neglect the former. (Matthew seeks to avoid giving the impression that Jesus desires to abolish the Law; cf. 5:17–19.) They strain out a gnat (in pouring wine into a container), but swallow a camel—perhaps a proverbial saying. That the camel was an unclean animal, Lev. 11:4, is also involved here.

5. **vv. 25–26** (cf. Lk. 11:39–41) They cleanse the outside of vessels; let them first clean the inside (fig. for purifying the heart) before attending to externals.

6. **vv. 27–28** (cf. Lk. 11:44) They are like whitewashed tombs, inside which are bones and all uncleanness. (Contact with human remains is defiling in the Jewish view.) Externally, they seem righteous; within, they are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. (Originally tombs were whitewashed before Passover to warn passers-by against contact; cf. Num. 19:16. However, the beautifying effect of this also came to be appreciated.)

7. **vv. 29–33** (cf. Lk. 11:47–48) They build tombs to the prophets (some of the ornate tombs around Jerusalem were interpreted as such), adorn the (sepulchral) monuments of (or, make new ornamental monuments for) righteous men (again meaning the prophets), declaring that had they themselves lived in the time of their fathers they would not have joined in the shedding of the blood of the prophets! Thereby they bear witness to themselves that they are sons of those who murdered the prophets! Let them (now proceed to) make full the measure of (the guilt of) their fathers (by creating more martyrs, in putting Jesus and his followers to death. That will hasten the Judgment Day.). The conclusion of the woes and the climax in

the indictment are reached with an impassioned rhetorical question: How will they, being serpents and vipers (3:7, 12:34), (be able to) flee from the judgment of Gehenna (cf. on Mk. 9:43–47)?

vv. 34–36 (cf. Lk. 11:49–51) Further opportunity to emulate the prophet-killers of old is now going to be furnished them. Jesus is going to send them prophets, wise men, and scribes. (This can hardly have been spoken by the historical Jesus, who believed in his own imminent return, but is an utterance of the living Christ of the Church. It reflects the early Jewish-Christian organization in Matthew's area in its mention of three classes of leaders. Luke has two classes: prophets and Apostles.) Some they will kill and crucify (this applied better to the Apostles; cf. Acts 12:2 and the ancient reports of Paul's execution and Peter's crucifixion), some will be scourged in synagogues (cf. 2 Cor. 11:24) and pursued from city to city (cf. Acts 14:19), to the end that (the punishment for all) the righteous blood (i.e., the blood of all the righteous men) may come upon them. The righteous men here include all those from Abel (Gen. 4:10) to Zacharias the son of Barachias, whom they slew between the sanctuary and the altar. (This may mean Zechariah the son of Berechia, Zech. 1:1, and if so presupposes that his book stood near the end of the Canon of the Prophets—as it does in the Hebrew Bible—and that there was a legend about his death. Perhaps the legend confused him with Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, 2 Chron. 24:20. In the Palestinian Talmud a fourth-century rabbi asks another where the latter Zechariah was slain—in the Court of the Israelites or in the Court of the Women? The answer is: in neither, but in the Court of the Priests i.e., in the area around the altar. Those who regard Matthew's saying as a recent formulation think that the individual meant is Zacharias son of Bariscaeus (corrupted name) whom the Zealots killed in the Temple in A.D. 68, cf. Jos., *B. J.*, *4*, 5, 5—a suggestion already advanced by William Whiston in notes to his Josephus translation of 1737.) With an Amen-saying Jesus predicts that (all) this (blood) will come over *this generation.* (That he had foretold the catastrophe of A.D. 70 was very impressive to people looking back on this holocaust.)

23:37–39 Prophecy over Jerusalem (Lk. 13:34–35). The discourse is provided with an effective conclusion—the saying, so full of feeling, addressed to Jerusalem. The words "how often would I have gathered your children" surprise the reader, since the Synoptic Gospels, unlike John, report no visit of Jesus to the city except that which brought on the Passion. But this is probably to be understood as a saying of the heavenly Christ, who through his Apostles made every effort to convert Jerusalem. The prediction that their "house" (probably fig. for the city; cf. Jer. 12:7; Hos. 8:1; 9:15) will be forsaken may reflect the desolate situation after A.D. 70. They will not see him again until he returns and is hailed by them with Ps. 118:26a. If v. 39 is still addressed to scribes and Pharisees it would imply the possibility of their conversion. It seems more likely, however, that the words are addressed to the disciples or to the crowd, and resume 21:9, for the purpose of bringing home to the reader that in the story of the entry into Jerusalem, too, a hint at the Second Coming was intended, and not merely acclaim for the historical Jesus.

24:1–3 Prediction of the Destruction of the Temple (Mk. 13:1–4; Lk. 21:5–7). Matthew omits the incident of the widow's mite, Mk. 12:41–44, as fitting too poorly between the two long discourses of ch. 23 and 24:4 ff. But he makes use of Mk. 13:1–4, since it sets the stage in suitable manner for the next discourse. In Mark the disciples, when Jesus was departing from the Temple, exclaim about the great stones and the buildings. Here they draw near to Jesus in the same situation to show him the buildings of the Temple. The reply of Jesus varies only slightly: "Do you not see all these things?" The continuation is prefaced with an "Amen I say unto you," and a "here" is injected in the prediction that no stone will be left on the other.

Matthew adheres to Mark in not making any transition to the next scene, where Jesus is seated on the Mount of Olives. But he leaves out the localization ("opposite the Temple") and instead of having four disciples ask Jesus about the future, he has all of them come to him with the question. The latter is revised in its second half; in place of Mark's "What is the sign when all these things will come about?" Matthew has: "What is the sign of thy second advent (Gr. *parousía*) and of the end of the world age (associated therewith)?" Mark had expected the apocalyptic events in close connection with the fall of the Temple, but this expectation had not been realized. Matthew therefore gives them independent status. The prophecy of the destruction of the Temple thus becomes a minor preliminary.

The Synoptic Apocalypse

24:4–36 (Mk. 13:5–37, Lk. 21:8–36)

24:4–8 Signs of the Second Coming (Mk. 13:5–8; Lk. 21:8–11). Matthew follows Mark's text closely here. He clarifies the prediction about those who will come, saying, "I am he," by having them say, "I am the Christ (= the Messiah)." The famines are put before the earthquakes.

24:9–14 Admonitions for the Beginning of the Sufferings (Mk. 13:9–13; Lk. 21: 12–19). The warning "see to yourselves" is omitted, and the initial prediction that follows it is changed to: "Then they will deliver you up to *tribulation*" (Gr. *thlípsis;* Mk.: to councils and synagogues). The change was made and the continuation in Mark dropped because this material was already used by Matthew in 10:17–21. Matthew then proceeds directly to Mk. 13: 12b–13, but broadens the horizon by revising Mark's "you will be hated by all" to "you will be hated by all *the nations.*" Jewish Christians of Matthew's day were suffering from the anti-Semitism which was rife in Syria, as well as in Alexandria.

New material is added in vv. 10–14. Then many will be offended (= fall away) and betray and hate each other. False prophets will arise and deceive many. Because of the increase of lawlessness (Antinomian teaching? 5:19; 7:15 f.), the love of the many (i.e., the majority) will grow cold (cf. Rev. 2:4; 3:15). Here Matthew introduces a Marcan verse: "He who endures to the end will be saved" (= Mk. 13:13b), and follows that with Mk. 13: 10, with slight but significant revision; for while Mark has "it is necessary for the gospel to be preached first to all nations (before the end can come)," Matthew transforms this into a prediction that "this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in all the world 'unto (= as) a witness' (expression drawn from Mk. 13:9?) to all the (Gentile) nations" and adds: "and then the end will come (cf. 1 Cor. 15:24)." Cf. also 26:13.

24:15–22 The Crisis in Judaea (Mk. 13: 14–20; Lk. 21:20–24). Mark's text is followed closely with a few variations. In referring to the "abomination of desolation" Matthew adds "the one spoken of through Daniel the prophet" (Dan. 9:27, 12:11), and clarifies Mark's "standing where it should not be" by substituting "standing in the Temple." In v. 20 he interprets Mark's "pray that it may not happen in the winter" by saying "pray that your *flight* may not happen in the winter" (presupposing knowledge of what had taken place) and adds "or on a Sabbath" —an indication that Matthew or his constituency was Sabbatarian. In v. 21 he abridges Mark's phraseology, while in v. 22 he says "if the days were not shortened" (instead of "if the Lord did not shorten the days"), perhaps because the word "Lord" in that passage meant God rather than Christ.

24:23–25 Admonitions for the Culmination of the Crisis (Mk. 13:21–23). Mark is followed closely in this warning against pseudo Messiahs and pseudo prophets. The words "do you see to it" of Mk. 13:23 are omitted in the last verse.

24:26–28 The Day of the Son of Man (Lk. 17:23–24, 37), Q. These sayings are not found in Mark, but are given in a different connection and more briefly in Luke, and are thus from Q. If it is reported that Jesus (has returned and) is in the wilderness they are not to go out (to find him); if (he is said to be) in inner rooms they are not to believe it. His return will be like the lightning—visible to everyone everywhere. The next saying is puzzling: Where the carcass may be, the eagles gather (cf. Job 39:27, 30). As it occurs in an eschatological passage in Luke, Matthew has not put it here unsuitably. It is best understood as a proverb, which the reader must apply. The meaning seems to be that as the buzzards unfailingly appear where there is a carcass, so men will be drawn to the right spot when the eschatological judgment takes place under the aegis of the Son of man.

24:29–31 The Second Coming of the Son of Man (Mk. 13:24–27; Lk. 21:25–28). Matthew gives Mark's text with slight variations. Thus at the very beginning he has: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days" (Mk.: "But in those days, after that tribulation"). He adds: "Then the sign of the Son of man (i.e., the phenomenon of his appearance? or an advance indication of it? In rabbinic texts a light—cf. Is. 60:1—is the 'sign of the Messiah') will appear in heaven and all the tribes of the earth will mourn." (This is a combination of Zech. 12:10 and Dan. 7:13 and has a counterpart in Rev. 1:7.) Matthew rejoins Mark in describing the coming of the Son of man and his sending forth of the angels to gather the elect, but injects the idea that this sending forth is done amid the blowing of "a great trumpet" (cf. 1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:52).

24:32–33 Parable of the Fig Tree (Mk. 13:28–29; Lk. 21:29–31). The text here is similar to that of Mark, with only slight shifts of word order in the Greek.

24:34–36 The Time of the Second Coming (Mk. 13:30–32; Lk. 21:32–33). The divergences from Mark are minor. Matthew speaks of "the angels of the heavens" instead of "the angels in heaven," and reinforces the final reference to God with "alone."

24:37–41 Parables of the Return (Lk. 17:26–27, 34–35), Q. Whereas Mark now presents the conclusion of the discourse, Matthew continues it with Q sayings, which Luke has in a different connection. The aim is to keep alive the apocalyptic expectation, which evidently was fading in the Church in his day. The present situation with respect to the return of the Son of man is compared, vv. 37–39, to that of the days of Noah, when people (disregarding the warning given by Noah's building of an ark) were feasting and drinking, marrying and giving (females) in marriage, till the day of Noah's entering the ark, and did not perceive their danger until the flood came (when it was too late). In the further saying of vv. 40–41, the Q allusion to what will happen *on that night* is left out. Matthew thinks of it as a daytime event. Hence for Q's "two on one bed," of whom one is taken (Lk. 17:34), he substitutes two in the field.

24:42–44 Parable of the Watchful Householder (Lk. 12:39–40), Q. Matthew leads off with an exhortation to watch, since they do not know on what day their Lord comes. This is reinforced by the example of the householder who would watch if he knew in which watch of the night the thief is coming. This material is a counterpart to Mk. 13:33–37, where the man going on a journey bids his servants watch.

24:45–51 The Faithful and Wise Servant and the Bad Servant (Lk. 12:42–46), Q

vv. 45–47 The peculiar question form, with which this saying began in Q, is retained. One would expect a simple statement: "The faithful and wise servant is he who, etc." Q spoke of a steward, but subsequently refers to him as a servant (cf. on 18:23–35). Matthew, therefore, substitutes servant for steward at the outset. A slave with the function of steward is nevertheless meant, whom his Lord (used with an eye to the man's representing Christ) set over his household to give them the food at the (proper) time. A beatitude is pronounced upon him if the Lord on coming finds him doing (his duty). An Amen-saying declares that he will set him over all his possessions.

vv. 48–50 This material is hardly the original continuation of the preceding. The parable of the faithful servant has ended. It is quite likely that there was also a parable about the bad servant, of which the first part was omitted, because it ran in the same manner. Its continuation was tacked on to the parable of the faithful servant:

If that evil servant says in his heart that his Lord is delaying (his return) and begins to smite his fellow servants and eats and drinks with the drunkards (then) the Lord of that servant will come on a day on which he does not expect (him) and at an hour he does not know and will "divide him." This peculiar statement is supported by Luke and so comes from Q, but it is wholly improbable that it was originally meant in the sense of cutting someone in half (or "in pieces," cf. Ex. 29:17 LXX), or even decapitating a person, as some Rabbinic parables could suggest. The continuation: "and will give him his portion with the hypocrites" (Lk.: unbelievers) assumes that the servant remains alive. He had deceived the master into thinking he could be trusted with responsibility, but now is properly classified. It may be, however, that the word for "portion" has been misplaced. The Sinaitic Syriac in the parallel of Lk. 12:46 reads "he will divide his portion and set him with the unbelievers." (Matthew's "hypocrites" fits better.) But if one assumes on the basis of the underlying Aramaic that "divide him" originally meant "distribute *to* him" (namely: a beating) then one would be staying close to the Greek text. The Sinaitic Syriac reading may have been influenced by an apocryphal Gospel.

v. 51 The tendency to work in the idea of an eschatological punishment in view of the interpretation of the Lord as Christ and his return being the second coming may have corrupted v. 50 and it certainly led to this addition which is not found in Luke: there there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth. As no place was mentioned the "there" is lacking proper connection.

25:1–13 Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins. The discourse of Jesus is imagined as continuing, taking on the form of relating parables. The one given here belongs to Matthew's special material. The introductory formula (cf. on 13:24) is here put in the future: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be compared to." Again the comparison is with the story as a whole. Ten Virgins, proleptically called "foolish" and "wise," went forth to await the coming of the bridegroom. When he tarried they became tired and all of them slumbered. In the middle of the night the cry sounded: "Behold, the bridegroom (is coming). Go ye forth to meet him." Then all the virgins arose and "adorned" (i.e., put in order) their lamps. The five foolish ones now asked the wise ones for some of their oil. (The latter are evidently imagined as having filled their lamps fully before starting out, whereas the former had not done so.) The wise ones rejected this, lest the oil be insufficient for both groups, and suggested that they go to the vendors (whom they naturally had to rouse out of bed) and buy oil for themselves. While the foolish ones were doing this the bridegroom arrived. Those who were ready went in with him to the marriage celebration and the door was locked. When the foolish ones came, saying "Lord, Lord open to us" the groom declared in an Amen-saying that he did not know them (cf. 7:23).

The parable is clearly an allegory of the future coming of the Son of man. The central importance of the delay in his arrival suggests the disappointment of the expectations that were still vividly held when Paul wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians. The symbolism of Christ as bridegroom and the congregation as bride is old (2 Cor. 11:2–3; Mk. 2:19) and evidently had a particular appeal in the Hellenistic world, where the bride soon became symbolical of the individual soul for the gnostics. For the nocturnal hour of the coming of the bridegroom it may have some significance that Paul says that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night (1 Thess. 5:2). The cry to go forth to a meeting (Gr. *apántēsis*) of the groom is significant; the same word is not only used by Paul in 1 Thess. 4:15 for meeting the returning Lord, but was employed in the Hellenistic world for the popular reception of exalted personages at their arrival (Gr. *parousía*) at a city. The entry of the five wise virgins and the locking out of the five foolish ones is simply another way of describing the separation that will be made at the Last Judgment (13:36 f.; 25:31 f.). The word

"Lord" as applied to the bridegroom is used with an eye to his representing Christ. The main point of the parable lies in the praise of those properly prepared for the delay in the return of Christ and in criticism of their opposites. At the bottom is a hortatory purpose—not a rational one as to who can or cannot be saved.

If there is an underlying parable spoken by the historical Jesus, it has been revised to such a degree that it cannot be restored with confidence. The objections made against its authenticity on the ground of divergence from Jewish marriage customs, however, may not all be valid. If one will suppose that the groom is fetching the bride from another city—a thing that may have been very common among Hellenistic Jews—then some of them disappear. A homecoming celebration was certainly in order. The local relatives and neighbors, who had had no opportunity to be present at the actual marriage in a distant locality, would want to celebrate, and the feast arranged by the groom would naturally be called a marriage feast (cf. Tobit 8:19 and 11:18). A greater cause for perplexity is the omission of any allusion to the bride. But aside from the fact that a bride is not mentioned in other parables speaking of a marriage feast, there is a special reason for leaving her out. The bride could only be allegorical of the Church, and here the ten virgins symbolize the latter's constituency.

The closing exhortation to watch, since one knows neither the day nor the hour, reverts to Mark's conclusion of the discourse (Mk. 13:35).

25:14–30 Parable of the Talents (Lk. 19:12–27), Q. A further parable from Matthew's special material is added to the discourse. It begins with "for just as." The "just as (Gr. *hōsper*), like the "as" of Mk. 4:31, is merely the equivalent of the Semitic *le*. The "for" seems to link this with the previous exhortation to watch (v. 13). With the parable Matthew then intends to illustrate some aspect of the vigilance required of the Christian.

A man going on a journey calls "his own servants" and gives them the care of his funds—five, two, and one talents (a talent = *c.* one thousand dollars; Luke speaks of minas = *c.* twenty dollars), according to his idea of the relative ability of the three to handle them. The first and second double their amounts, while the third goes off, digs up the ground, and hides his lord's money. After a long time the lord of the servants comes (back) and holds an accounting (18:23) with them. The first and second render their reports, and are praised, assured of greater responsibility and told to enter into the "joy" of their Lord (fig. for a banquet, as rabbinic parallels show). The third now brings back his one talent and explains his inaction by fear of losing it. He justifies his fear by insolently misrepresenting his lord's character. Calling him both wicked and slothful, his lord tells him that with such an attitude he should have put this money with the bankers, so that when the owner returned he would have received it back with interest. He then directs that the one talent be taken away from this servant and given to the one to whom he originally entrusted five. This is justified with the saying already found in 13:12: "To him that hath shall be given, etc." (That the servant with the five talents gets the extra one evidently caused some dissatisfaction to Christian readers, as Lk. 19:25 shows more clearly than Matthew's version.)

This saying, invoked already by Q, is a wisdom observation of a worldly nature, and not too well suited to express what is morally required, viz., that he who does not act in the Lord's interest will certainly not be rewarded, and may even be punished. This conclusion is reached, however, by the command to cast the useless servant into the outermost darkness, where there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth (i.e., Gehenna; cf. on Mk. 9:43–47). The parable, therefore, urges faithfulness in doing one's duty, according as one has been given it by the Lord, and promises reward and punishment at his return. The punishment decreed, of course, the identity of the Lord stands fully revealed. It was already hinted at in the words of v. 23, "enter into the joy of thy Lord."

This noteworthy Q parable was much revised by Luke. The apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews (of which only fragments reported by Church Fathers are known) also had a version of it, in which only one servant increased his entrusted funds; the other used them up with harlots and flute girls, the third hid them. The master praised the first, rebuked the second and imprisoned the third. Both versions show to what extent parable materials were exposed to the danger of change. It is safe to assume that changes had occurred even before any of them were written down.

25:31–46 Description of the Last Judgment. The discourse ends with an apocalyptic prophecy, into which a shepherd parable is brought as illustrative. When the Son of man comes in his glory, attended by all his angels (16:27), he will sit on the throne of his glory and all nations will be gathered before him (Dan. 7:13–14). And he will separate them from one another, just as the shepherd separates the sheep (generally white) and the goats (generally black in Palestine), setting the latter on the left, the former on the right or favored side. The thought of a division of sheep and goats has evidently been suggested by Ezek. 34:17. While a universal background has been set up in this introduction only one phase of the world judgment actually receives attention in what follows—the judging of Christendom. In the parable of the tares it was already made clear that the Church contains both good and bad, and that these could not be separated until the judgment. If one had pressed the author on the question, What about the nations? he would no doubt have said: "They are spectators until their turn comes, as prophesied in Dan. 7:26 ff." But unlike the author of Daniel, Matthew is not interested in the fate of empires; Christians were a nonpolitical group, in view of their precarious situation.

The King first addresses those on his right. (The shift in the title from "Son of man" to "King" is surprising, but cf. the allusion to the kingdom of the Son of man in 16:28.) He addresses them as "ye blessed of my Father" (because of the bliss about to be referred to) and invites them to inherit (i.e., to take possession of) the kingdom prepared for them since the founding of the world. He then lists the things they have done. On the formal side, Ezek. 34:4, "The weak you have not strengthened, the sick you have not healed, etc." has evidently stimulated the imagination. In the case of those on the right, the negative statements had to be turned into positive ones. At the astonished question, When had they done to him these things?—which are repeated for emphasis—he replies that what they did to one of the least of his brethren they did to him.

Those on the left then are given their verdict. They are called "cursed ones" and bid to depart to the eternal fire prepared for (but not yet received by) the Devil and his angels. (The stimulus of Dan. 7:10a–11b in the medley of ideas producing this should not be overlooked.) The charges against them are then stated, and are the negatives of the praises given the righteous. Addressing the Son of man as "Lord"—showing that they too profess Christianity—they ask when had they not ministered to him? (He was not on earth in their time. How could they?) He replies that what they have not done to one of these least ones they have not done to him. The sins of omission alone are stressed. This does not mean that the sins of commission do not count. The group being addressed was one that exercised its church discipline and had dealt with those guilty of obvious sins. The verdict in this case, too, flows from the Sermon on the Mount, though the description does not avail itself of the potentialities of 7:22–23. In that passage even certain positive things that professing Christians claim to have done in Christ's name were given no recognition.

The sequel is described with the utmost brevity. Both groups depart "these to everlasting punishment, but the righteous to everlasting life."

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this prophecy. It rivals that of Luke's parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:29 f.) as stimulus for charity. Unlike that parable it is concerned with the charity that begins with one's own group. Christ regards all his followers as his brethren, and the least of them is as important to him as the greatest. He construes love shown to them as shown to himself. What among Jews was loving one's neighbor as oneself is here transposed into loving one's fellow Christian as one loves Christ. With this section the teaching of Jesus to the Church, begun in the Sermon on the Mount, reaches a grand finale.

C. The Passion Narrative 26:1–27:66 (Mk. 14–15; Lk. 22–23)

26:1–5 The Plot of the High Priests and Scribes (Mk. 14:1–2; Lk. 22:1–2; cf. Jn. 11:47–51). Matthew now rejoins Mark, but seeks to establish a smoother connection by noting the completion of the discourse that had preceded, and by having Jesus himself point out what Mark had simply stated historically: that the Passover was only two days off. He omits Mark's allusion to the Unleavened Bread festival and adds that the Son of man was (now) to be betrayed, for the purpose of being crucified. (He previously had predicted the event in 20:19.)

Then follows the plot. Matthew includes "the elders of the people" among the plotters, along with high priests and scribes. Mark's vague "they were seeking to arrest him" is turned into a gathering of the Synedrium in the hall of the high priest. The latter, we here are told, was named Caiaphas. Mark had not given his name, either because he did not know it or because he wanted Pilate to be the sole identified personage to hold the stage. The combination Annas and Caiaphas (Lk. 3:2; Acts 4:6) is textually suspect, and Caiaphas may also be an addition in Jn. 11:49; 18:12 ff. Nevertheless Caiaphas actually was the high priest at the time of the death of Jesus, for his term of office extended from A.D. 18–36/37. Josephus calls him Joseph, but also knows his surname Caiaphas (*Ant., 18,* 2, 2). Rabbinic sources speak of "the house of *Qayyāphā,*" thus giving the correct spelling of the name. Its meaning, however, is uncertain ("the soothsayer"?). The Synedrium deliberates over what, in Mark, the high priests and scribes were only seeking to accomplish, without mention of a formal meeting of that body.

26:6–13 The Anointing in Bethany (Mk. 14:3–9; cf. Lk. 7:36–50; Jn. 12:1–8). Copying Mark Matthew makes some omissions: that Jesus "sat at table"; that the ointment was "pure nard"; the value of the ointment; the rebuking of the woman; the command of Jesus to let her alone and his observation that they are able whenever they *wish* to do good to the poor (in Matthew's view this was not a matter of wish, but an obligation), and the saying, "She has done what she could." Some changes of Mark's wording, too, may be noticed; Matthew directly identifies the disciples with the "some" who were indignant; he notes that Jesus knew what they were saying to themselves; for the "anointing beforehand" of Mark he says that in pouring (9:17) the ointment on his body she has acted with an eye to his burial; he speaks of *this* gospel being preached *in* the whole world rather than of *the* gospel being preached *to* the whole world. Cf. 24:14.

26:14–16 The Betrayal by Judas (Mk. 14:10–11; Lk. 22:3–6). With his "then" and a more elaborate sentence, Matthew effects a smoother transition than Mark did from the preceding incident to this one. He makes the going of Judas the Iscariotes (10:4) to the high priests more vivid by having him ask for an offer of money to betray Jesus. The allusion to their joy is omitted, and instead of their promising to give him money Matthew speaks of their settling (or appointing) for him thirty pieces of silver. (This is often translated "they paid to him," as in the R.S.V., but advance payment is intrinsically unlikely, and the Old Syriac translation renders as above.) There probably was no real knowledge of the sum promised, or Mark would have mentioned it. It is an inference from Zech. 11:12, taken as prophetic of this incident.

27:17–19 Preparations for the Passover (Mk. 14:12–16; Lk. 22:7–13). Matthew here uses Mark's "unleavened bread," but omits his "when they sacrificed the Passover" (in 26:2 he omitted the former). In general he abridges Mark's account. Instead of Jesus' sending two disciples, the whole group is sent. They are to go to so-and-so to give him a message. (Their happening on and following a jar carrier is thus deleted.) The message itself is changed from a question seeking an invitation to an announcement of Jesus' intention to come to him to "keep the Passover" (Ex. 12:48) at his house. Matthew prefixes to the message the words: "My time (Gr. *kairós,* i.e., the time of decisive importance for him and his cause) is at hand." The message implies that the man is known to Jesus and can understand what the Lord means. He is dealt with as though he were a Christian of the Jerusalem church. The description of the room (Mk. 14:15) is omitted, as is the allusion to the disciples' finding things as Jesus had said to them.

The Last Supper

26:20–29 (Mk. 14:17–25; Lk. 22:14–38)

26:20–25 The Beginning of the Meal (Mk. 14:17–21; Lk. 22:14, 21–23). Omitting Jesus' arrival with the disciples, Matthew immediately relates: "He sat down with the Twelve." In the prediction that one of them would betray Jesus, the words "who eats with me" are left out. The question of the disciples is put more impressively: "Is it I, Lord?" and the answer likewise: "He who dipped the hand *into the dish* with me, *this one will betray me.*" In Mark there was no attempt to identify the traitor. Matthew, however, makes Judas ask: "Is it I, Rabbi?" (The usual address "Lord" is avoided in his case.) Jesus replies, "Thou hast said it" (cf. also 26:64; 27:11). The meaning seems to be "you yourself said it—not I"; it is an idiom that has parallels in rabbinic sources. No mention is made of any reaction on the part of the other disciples.

26:26–29 The Institution of the Lord's Supper (Mk. 14:22–25; Lk. 22:15–20; cf. 1 Cor. 11:23–25). Mark is followed with minor variations. Matthew makes clear that Jesus gave the bread to his *disciples,* and not only bade them take it but *eat* it. Instead of reporting how all drank from the cup he gave them and then having Jesus give an explanatory saying, Matthew quotes Jesus' command to drink, and joins the explanation with it. In the latter he adds the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins," which neither Luke nor Paul support. It is worthy of note that in 3:6 he struck this phrase out with respect to the Baptism by John (cf. Mk. 1:4). Its introduction here has given the ritual an important application for the individual. In the Amen-saying of Mk. 14:25 some changes are made. It is linked more closely with the preceding, and hence the "amen" is omitted. Instead of "I will drink no more from the fruit of the vine," Matthew has "not will I *henceforth* drink from *this* fruit of the vine"; and for "when I drink it new in the kingdom of God," he has "when I drink it *with you* in the kingdom *of my Father.*"

26:30–35 On the Way to the Mount of Olives; Prediction of Peter's Denial (Mk. 14:26–31; Lk. 22:39, 22:31–34). Again there is close adherence to Mark. The prediction "all will be offended" is supplemented by "on my account this night." The Scripture quotation is extended with (sheep) "of the flock," though this is not found in Zech. 13:7. The apostasy is not because of Jesus, but because of the peril. Peter's overconfident remark that others may desert him, but not he, is elaborated: "if all were offended on thy account I will never be offended." The "twice" before the cock's crow does not appear here nor does it appear in Luke. Their agreement raises the question whether it originally stood in Mark's text.

26:36–46 Gethsemane (Mk. 14:32–42; Lk. 22:40–46; cf. Jn. 18:1). Matthew follows Mark with minor variations. James and John are not mentioned separately, but are lumped together as the two sons of Zebedee. Matthew substitutes "he began to be sorrowful" for Mark's "he began to tremble" (R.S.V.: be greatly distressed). The disciples are asked to watch with him (in Mk. only: to watch). Jesus falls "on his face" rather than "on the ground" in praying. The purpose of his prayer, which Mark states objectively, is made part of the prayer of Jesus and replaces the words "all things are possible to thee, remove (this cup)." The initial "Abba" is omitted. Matthew says "not *as* I will but *as* thou wilt" in place of Mark's "what." The prayer is less hopeful than in Mark.

In returning the first time Jesus addresses his words to Peter, but in the plural so as to include the others. The name Simon is omitted; the words "with me" are added after "can you not watch?" The renewed departure of Jesus to pray is underlined with "a second time." Jesus does not, as in Mark, "utter the same word" or saying, but varies it: *"My* Father, if this cannot pass except I drink it, may thy will be done." In this second prayer the hope of deliverance has dwindled. In the second return to the three disciples, Matthew omits "they did not know what they were answering him." Whereas Mark did not dwell on the third prayer at all—though he presupposes it—Matthew records it and this time uses the phrase Mark had used of the second prayer: "He said the same word." At the final return to the three disciples, Mark's "it is enough" is omitted. The remaining words of Jesus are the same, except for minor changes of Greek expression.

26:47–56 The Betrayal and Arrest (Mk. 14:43–52; Lk. 22:47–53; cf. Jn. 18:2–11). Matthew follows Mark closely. He makes Mark's crowd that comes to apprehend Jesus a "big" one; for the scribes he substitutes "the elders of the people." From Judas' instruction to the prospective captors he leaves out the words "lead him away safely." In addressing Jesus, the betrayer says, "Greetings (Gr. *chaire,* "rejoice"; cf. 27:29), Rabbi" (cf. 26:25). Matthew supplies a response of Jesus: "Friend (20:13), why art thou here?" If in Mark it was "one of those standing by" who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, it here is "one of those with Jesus." Matthew adds the small detail that the man "stretched forth his hand" in drawing the sword. He feels it necessary to have the act of violence rebuked in vv. 52–54; Jesus warns that all those (of his followers) who take the sword (in hand) will perish by the sword. (Such human intervention on his behalf is unnecessary.) Does the swordsman (foolishly) think that Jesus could not beseech his Father, and (Semitic "parataxis" construction here meaning "so that") he would put at his disposal more than twelve legions of angels? (The whole Roman army was composed of only twenty-five legions in A.D. 17, a legion being six thousand men.) But how then (if such angelic interference took place) would the Scriptures be fulfilled (which say) that thus it must come about? (Prophecy had foretold the Messiah's arrest, trial and death.) In Mk. 14:48 Jesus then speaks (to his captors); Matthew adds "to the crowds." Matthew's prefixed "in that hour" translates a Semitic idiom and here means "in that moment." The speech is as in Mark, except that Jesus says he *sat* teaching in the Temple. Mark's brief words about Scripture fulfillment are given more solemnly and with special reference to "the prophets." The "all" who left him and fled are identified as the disciples. But Matthew omits Mark's item about the unnamed youth who fled naked, Mk. 14:51–52.

26:57–75 Jesus before the Synedrium; Peter's Denial (Mk. 14:53–72; Lk. 22:54–71; cf. Jn. 18:12–27)

vv. 57–66 Matthew clarifies Mark's opening statement. Jesus was taken to (the palace of) the high priest *Caiaphas* (26:3), where scribes and elders (order changed and "all the high priests" is omitted) *had assembled.* In mentioning Peter's sitting with the servants he omits Mark's "warming himself by the light" (so also in 26:69) as too human a touch for the sacred narrative, and substitutes that he wanted "to see the outcome." The semblance of objectivity on the part of the Synedrium presupposed by Mark's "seeking testimony" is abandoned; Matthew says flatly "they sought false testimony." The statement that "many bore false witness" is changed to "they did not find many false witnesses." For Mark's "some stood up and bore false witness" he substitutes "two came forward and said." The saying attributed to Jesus in Mk. 14:58 is altered to "I *am able* to destroy (Mk.: I *will* destroy) the Temple of God (Mk.: this Temple made of hands) and to build it in three days (Mk.: "and in three days I will build another not made of hands"). Cf. a further variant of the saying in Jn. 2:19. Matthew's wording of it as an assertion of power and not of intention excludes any possible fault, and so he does not have the remark that their testimony did not agree. In what follows he leaves out some phrases that can be spared, such as that the high priest "stood up in the midst" and that Jesus "did not answer anything." Unlike Mark, Matthew (and he alone) makes the high priest seek to impose an oath on Jesus; he adjures him to say if he is the Christ, the son of the living God (Mk.: "art thou the son of the Blessed?"). Instead of "I am," Jesus replies, "Thou sayest." This is not intended to be evasive, but as in 26:25 means: "You said it—not I." By replying in this manner Jesus avoided the oath (cf. 5:34), but agreed in substance (cf. 27: 11). A solemn and clarifying "but I say unto you: henceforth" is prefixed to the prediction already found in Mark that they will see the apocalyptic figure of Dan. 7:13. The high priest rends his outer garments (Gr. *himátia;* cf. 2 Kings 2:12, LXX, and similar passages), not his undergarments (Gr. *chitónas,* loosely used for "garments" by Mark). Matthew makes the high priest declare, "He has blasphemed" before asking the group what they think.

vv. 67–68 In the scene that ensues the Synedrium members spit in his face (Mk.: some began to spit at him). That they struck him (with sticks) is added, but that his face was covered up is omitted. Mark's "Prophesy" is expanded to "Prophesy to us, O Messiah: which one (of us) was the one hitting thee?" Matthew omits that the servants gave Jesus blows (with sticks). He attributed that to the Synedrium in v. 67.

vv. 69–75 The continuation of Peter's story follows as in Mark. He was sitting in the hall outside (Mk.: "below"). A maidservant came to him (Mk.: one of the high priest's maidservants came, and seeing him warming himself, looked at him and said). She accused him of having been with Jesus the Galilean (Mk.: with the Nazarene, Jesus). Matthew makes Peter's denial occur in the presence of all. The words "I do not understand" are dropped in his reply. He goes forth to the gate (Gr. *pylṓn*), rather than outside to the vestibule (Gr. *proaúlion*). There is no cockcrow at this juncture, as in Mk. 14:68. In Mark the maid, looking at him, began again to speak to those standing (there). Matthew makes it a different maid, who spoke "to those (that were) there"; and instead of saying, "This one is one of them" as in Mark, she says, "This one was with Jesus the Nazoraean" (2:23). Whereas in Mark, Peter simply denies, in Matthew he denies with an oath, "I do not know the man." When the bystanders accuse Peter, they say, "Thy speech makes thee evident" (Mk.: "thou art a Galilean"). This revision is a clarification; Peter could be identified as a Galilean from his dialect. (The extant material of Galilean Aramaic is from a period several centuries after Christ. It has recently been increased by the discovery of *Neofiti I*—a complete copy of the so-called Fragmentary Targum; see p. 23.) Peter now begins to curse (himself) and to swear. The (single) cockcrow brings him to his senses (cf. the prediction 26:34). He goes outside weeping bitterly (Mk.: he began to weep).

27:1–2 Jesus Delivered to Pilate (Mk. 15: 1; Lk. 23:1; cf. Jn. 18:28). Mark has the whole Synedrium prepare a decree (a recommendation for Pilate) at daybreak, but Matthew has the high priests and the elders of the people take council *to kill him.* (Under Jewish law, 26:66 was as yet no valid decision, for none such could be taken at night in a capital case.) In repeating that Jesus was delivered to Pilate, Matthew adds the title "governor" (Gr. *hēgēmṓn,* cf. also Acts 23:24). This title is a military one, and is used by Josephus for any officer, when exercising command over a military unit. Pilate, too, is given this designation, *Ant., 18,* 3, 1. His official title was the Latin "procurator" (Gr. *epítropos*), which stressed the financial side of the gubernatorial post.

27:3–10 The End of Judas (Acts 1:18–19). Matthew interrupts Mark's story to introduce a piece of special material. Christian readers were evidently asking what became of Judas. In the tense situation in which Mark wrote, that would have seemed an idle question. When Judas saw that Jesus was condemned he was filled with remorse and brought the money (26: 15) back to the high priests and elders—the scribes again being omitted. (The incident is out of place here, because these men were busy at the time in bringing charges before Pilate.) He confessed that he had sinned in betraying "innocent blood" (Old Testament phrase; cf. 2 Kings

21:16). The high priests and elders replied, "What is that to us (Jn. 21:22)? See (to it) yourself" (i.e., it is your own business; cf. 27:24). He threw the money into the Temple (Gr. *naós*), meaning the "house" proper, but perhaps only in the sense of toward that building, departed (from the Temple), went away (from the city) and hanged himself. The high priests took the money (from where it had been thrown) and declaring that, since it was blood money, it was impossible to add it to the sacred treasure (Aram. *qorbānā;* so also in Jos., *B. J., 2,* 9, 4, where Pilate uses the Temple treasure for a water conduit; the same word but in the sense of "offering" 15:5; cf. Mk. 7:11). Under Pharisaic rules the Jews were very particular about the possession of tainted money, not merely its religious use.

The high priests therefore held a council and bought "the potter's field" for the burial of strangers. The field thus allegedly received the name "field of blood (-money)" by which it was still known in the author's day (to Christians living in the partially re-established city). But the Aramaic name is not given by Matthew (for that, cf. Acts 1:19). He sees this as fulfillment of what was spoken by the prophet Jeremiah. The quotation, so solemnly given, is, however, from Zechariah (11:12–13), though the text does not agree with either the Hebrew or the Greek. The two different readings which the Hebrew Masoretic text has preserved in Zech. 11:13 are both exploited for the story, and thus are shown to have been in existence in the first century: treasury (*ōṣār*) and potter (*yōṣēr*). The field may be derived from Jer. 32:6 f., and the idea of the potter may have been reinforced by Jer. 18:2 f. In this way the name of that more familiar prophet may have come to the fore in the consciousness of the author so that he attributes to him what Zechariah said. The allusion explaining the thirty pieces of silver as "the value of the valued one (i.e., the one valued by God) whom they (here) valued (i.e., set a price on) from (among) the sons of Israel" has been influenced by Lev. 27:8, where the priests are permitted to set a monetary value on a person whom one has vowed to give to the deity—a vow from which one could be released by paying a fixed amount of money. A man aged twenty to fifty was valued at fifty pieces of silver (shekels). So the price the high priests here placed on Jesus was a low one. Perhaps the reference to the "sons of Israel" hints at the sale of Joseph by his brethren (Gen. 37:28, for twenty shekels; cf. Lev. 27:5)—Judas being the counterpart of his ancient namesake Judah, who had suggested Joseph's sale.

27:11–14 The Trial before Pilate (Mk. 15:2–5; Lk. 23:2–5; cf. Jn. 18:28–38). To resume the connection with 27:1 Matthew adds a remark about Jesus' standing before the governor. He then follows Mark, but adds the elders to the accusers of Jesus and notes that Jesus answered nothing. He then omits the latter element from the question of Pilate, which, according to Matthew, was: *"Do you not hear* what things they *testify* against you?" He strengthens Mark's final statement; Jesus did not answer *a single word;* Pilate was *extremely* astonished.

27:15–26 The Sentence of Death (Mk. 15:6–15; Lk. 23:17–25; cf. Jn. 18:39–40; 19:4–16). Matthew's wording departs from Mark's, though in substance he relates the same thing. He omits the detail about Barabbas' record, merely describing him as a notorious prisoner. When the crowds assembled (Mk. stated more clearly that the crowd went up and began to demand that he follow the usual custom) Pilate asked them whether he should release Barabbas or Jesus "the one called Christ" (Mk.: shall I release to you the king of the Jews?). In the remark about Pilate's knowledge of the reason for Jesus' being handed over to him, he omits mention of the high priests.

v. 19 Here Matthew enriches the narrative with some special material: the message from Pilate's wife that he should have nothing to do (in a hostile sense) with "that righteous one," for she had suffered much (torture) concerning him in a dream (foreboding evil consequences for Pilate if he yielded to the request of the Jews). This may reflect reports current about the subsequent violent death of Pilate (cf. Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 2,* 7). It is not clear whether he died as a suicide or was executed by Nero. Philo (*c.* A.D. 40) refers to him as one of those who were punished by God for the evil they did. The intercession of Roman or Hellenistic women for prisoners was a frequent occurrence. Thus, e.g., Berenice successfully interceded with Agrippa for Justus of Tiberias (Jos., *Vit.*, 65).

vv. 20–23 Matthew expands the contents of Mk. 15:11; the elders participated in persuading the crowds, not only to ask for Barabbas but to destroy Jesus. Pilate asks which of the two he should release, whereupon the crowds say: "Barabbas." With v. 22 Matthew rejoins Mk. 15:12, but Pilate's question asking what he should do with the one whom they call king of the Jews is changed to: "What shall I do with Jesus, the one called Christ?" (cf. v. 17). They *all* say: "Let him be crucified" (Mk.: crucify him).

vv. 24–26 Matthew departs from Mark by omitting Pilate's desire to satisfy the crowd (Mk. 15:15a). Instead he adds special material here. When Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing and that a tumult (26:5) was developing, he washed his hands before the crowd (cf. Deut. 21:6 f. and Jos., *Ant., 4,* 8, 16) and declared himself innocent of this blood (that was going to be shed). He bade them see to it (27:4; Acts 18:15), viz., concern themselves about the matter as their own affair. The whole people thereupon invoked upon themselves and their children the blood that was to be shed—a remark Matthew's readers could ponder with awe as horribly fulfilled in the fearful events of the Jewish War of 68–70.

The conclusion of the scene follows Mk. 15:15: "He released Barabbas to them etc."

27:27–31 The Mocking of Jesus as King of the Jews (Mk. 15:16–20; cf. Jn. 19:1–3). The opening statement varies slightly from Mark. The soldiers of the governor (the escort as distinct from the Jerusalem garrison?) took Jesus into the praetorium (Mk.: they led him away to the inside of the hall, which is the praetorium; cf. on Mk. 15:16). They gathered unto him (Mk.: called together) the force in question (cf. on Mk. 15:16). Matthew mentions that they disrobed Jesus (presupposed by Mk. 15:20) and put about him a scarlet robe (Mk.: they clothed him in purple). To the plaiting of a crown of thorns for him Matthew adds that they placed it on his head and put a rod in his right hand (as scepter). He elaborates on the homage of the soldiers: they knelt before Jesus and struck him, as they hailed him with the words given by Mark. In the latter's version they struck Jesus' head with a rod (he does not have the scepter idea), spat at him and then knelt in homage; in Matthew they spit at him, take the rod (from his right hand) and strike him on the head. The conclusion closely follows Mark, but "the robe" replaces "the purple" and they lead him away for crucifixion (Mk.: they led him out that they might crucify him). Matthew thus avoids saying that the Roman soldiers were going to crucify Jesus.

27:32 On the Way to Calvary (Mk. 15:21; Lk. 23:26–32). Matthew's wording differs from Mark's here. Coming out (of the city) they found a Cyrenaean man by the name of Simon. Mark's report that he was coming from a field and that he was the father of Alexander and Rufus is left out.

27:33–44 The Crucifixion (Mk. 15:22–32; Lk. 23:33–43; cf. Jn. 19:17–24). Matthew gives Mark's opening statement in different words, but he varies from him only in respect to the wine given to Jesus, which he describes as mixed with gall (Mk.: wine with myrrh as an additive) and in saying that Jesus tasted it, but did not want to drink it (Mk.: which he did not take). Apparently Ps. 69:22, interpreted as predictive of this incident, has influenced the presentation. Or was the Aramaic word for myrrh (*mōrā*) misread as gall (*merartā*) in the purely consonantal text used by a translator?

vv. 35–37 Matthew now follows Mark's text more closely. After the casting of the lots he omits "for them, as to what each should take" and the important statement about the hour of the crucifixion. He adds without warrant from Mark's text that "sitting, they guarded him there." (While he has veiled the matter, it is clear that this refers to Roman soldiers.) Mark referred to an inscription (stating) his indictment: "The king of the Jews"; Matthew states that they put above his head the written indictment: *"This is Jesus* the king of the Jews" (Cf. the even fuller version Jn. 19:19).

v. 38 Matthew's "then were crucified with him" makes the crucifixion of the robbers take place later. (Mark thinks of all three as crucified at the same time.)

vv. 39–44 In the mockery of the passers-by Matthew adds to the invitation to come down from the cross: "if thou art the Son of God." To the priests and scribes Matthew adds the elders. There is uncertainty in Mark about how to connect the words "the Christ, the king of Israel," whether with what precedes or with what follows, or to take them as a question. Matthew shortens the title and supplies a verb: "King of Israel (that) he *is,* let him descend now, etc." He omits "that we may see," but then enriches the comments of the dignitaries with a Scripture quotation from Ps. 22:8, and adds "for he said I am the Son of God"—thus reverting to 26:63–64. In speaking of the mockery of those crucified with Jesus, Matthew repeats the word "robbers."

27:45–56 The Death of Jesus (Mk. 15: 33–41; Lk. 23:44–49; cf. Jn. 19:25–37). Matthew follows Mark's text with slight variations. The first words in the cry of Jesus are given as *"Hēleí, Hēleí"* rather than as *"Helōí, Helōí"* to make the mention of Elijah (Gr. *Hēleías*) more reasonable. (In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, Jesus calls out: "My strength, (my) strength, thou hast left me"—an interesting interpretation of the Hebrew *ēlī,* of Ps. 22:1 based on the late Hebrew word *eyāl,* "strength"). Matthew more suitably makes the bystanders, rather than the sponge-bearer, utter the comment about Elijah's coming to save him (Mk.: coming to take him down). He speaks of Jesus' crying out again with a loud voice in place of his "sending forth a loud voice," and of his "sending forth the spirit" (Mk.: "he expired").

vv. 51–54 Matthew adds further material to the rending of the curtain of the Temple mentioned by Mark; "the earth quaked, and the rocks were cleft, the sepulchers were opened and many bodies of sleeping saints were raised up, and, going forth from their tombs, . . . went into the holy city and appeared to many." But the statement about appearances of risen dead men was objectionable because of thoughts such as 1 Cor. 15:20 and Col. 1:18, and so was rendered innocuous by the later addition of the words "after his resurrection." But the incident loses its meaning if it does not happen right away. These alleged events are "prodigies," setting off the high importance of this moment in history. It was believed that such things *had* to happen at significant junctures, and from that assumption it followed for the ancient mind that they *did* happen. The classical writers use similar motifs. Thus, according to Virgil (*Georgics, 1,* 475) there was an earthquake when Caesar died, and according to Dio Cassius (*History of Rome, 51,* 17, 5) shades of the dead appeared in Alexandria before Vespasian took the city. It seems likely that Christian tradition has metamorphosed the appearance of *shades* to one of resurrected *bodies,* without, however, being able to set such appearances in relationship to that of Christ or to the final resurrection.

The earthquake and other phenomena terrified the captain or commander of a hundred soldiers (Gr. *hekatontárchēs;* Mk.: centurion) and his men, all of whom confess that truly this one (Mk.: this man) was the Son of God. (In Mk. it was the impression made by Jesus' death that elicited the confession from the centurion. The confession itself is given in more probable form in Lk. 23:47. Both Mk. and Mt. have "christianized" it—Mt. even providing a congregation of confessors.)

vv. 55–56 Matthew follows Mark in speaking of the women that were looking on, but gives them as "many" and as having followed Jesus from Galilee to minister to him. He omits Mark's closing differentiation between these ministering women and many others who had merely gone along with him to Jerusalem. He keeps Mary Magdalene, but for Mark's Salome he substitutes "the mother of the sons of Zebedee" (20:20), and for the "Mary of James the little (= short) and mother of Joses" he has "the Mary of James and mother of Joseph." (Joses is indeed a shortened form of Joseph.) On the problem of this "Mary," see on Mk. 15:40.

27:57–61 The Burial of Jesus (Mk. 15:42–47; Lk. 23:50–56; Jn. 19:38–42). Matthew omits the reference to the day of preparation. Whereas Mark called Joseph of Arimathea a respected councilor, who himself was awaiting the kingdom of God, Matthew describes him as a rich man (cf. Is. 53:9) and a disciple—probably an interpretation of Mark's "awaiting the kingdom." That he "took courage" is omitted, and the story is simplified by having Pilate assent to the request for the body without first summoning the centurion. According to Mark, Joseph bought linen, took Jesus down (from the cross), and wrapped him in it; Matthew says he took (i.e., received from Roman hands?) the body, and wrapped it in *clean* linen. The burial is described as in Mark, except that the tomb (Gr. *mnēmeíon*) is labeled a "new" one, the stone put at the door as a "great" one, and that Joseph's departure is recorded. Mark's report about the women witnesses of the burial is slightly changed: Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary" were sitting opposite "the grave" (Gr. *táphos*) while it was taking place. (Mk.: Mary Magdalene and Mary of Joses saw where he was laid.) Matthew's avoidance of copying "Mary of Joses" suggests that the text of Mark which he was using read as at present in 15:40 and 47, and that he did not know how to reconcile the two passages.

27:62–66 The Guard at the Tomb. Matthew here injects special material into the narrative. The high priests and Pharisees come to Pilate on "the day after the day of preparation" (i.e., on the remainder of the Sabbath which ended Saturday evening). Matthew thus brings in here the allusion to the day of preparation which he had omitted in 27:57. Addressing Pilate as "Sir" (lit. "Lord," but only courteous address, cf. 21:30), they say that they recall that this impostor (2 Cor. 6:8) while yet alive had said that he would arise *after three days.* They request that "the grave" be made secure *until the third day* (note combined use of the two variant formulae "after three days" and "on the third day"), lest his disciples come and steal the body and tell the people he is risen from the dead. The latter fraud (cf. 1 Cor. 15:15) would be worse (in its effect, cf. 12:45) than the former, viz., that Jesus gave himself out as Messiah. Pilate says briefly, "You (herewith) have a guard (Gr. *koustōdía,* Latin loan word). Go make it secure as you know" (i.e., with your own "know-how"). So they guarded "the grave," sealing the stone (with use of a string; cf. Dan. 6:17) "with the guard" (being present).

Since the story has no support from Mark, one may infer that it appeared later. It contains a number of improbabilities. That the Jewish leaders seal the grave on the Sabbath violates the Sabbath law. That they know of a prediction of Jesus concerning his resurrection shows a knowledge that even his disciples did not have; for the sayings of 16:21, 17:22 f., 20:17 f. were given privately to the latter and were not understood by them. The disciples have no thought of a resurrection and are amazed and baffled at the report of the empty tomb (Lk. 24:21–24). On the way to Jerusalem the sons of Zebedee even crave the places of honor in the coming kingdom (20:20–28). The saying about rebuilding the Temple in three days (26:61, 27:40) was scarcely understood as referring to the resurrection of Jesus; although it is interpreted in that manner in Jn. 2:21 f., this is in retrospect. There remains only the saying of 12:40 about the sign of Jonah; but the older form of the saying, as found in Lk. 11:30, points to a very different meaning of the allusion than Matthew gives. Cf. further on 28:11–15.

THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE

28:1–20 (Mk. 16; Lk. 24)

28:1–10 The Empty Tomb (Mk. 16:1–8; Lk. 24:1–11, cf. Jn. 20:1–10, 18). Matthew again follows Mark, but with changes. His initial words are more circumstantial: "Later than the Sabbath" (i.e., after its expiration), in the dawning of the first weekday (cf. on Mk. 16:1) Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary" (27:61)—

Mark's Salome is dropped—came to *see* "the grave." (The "seeing" is apparently an echo of Mk. 15:47.) Matthew has eliminated the women's purchase of spices and the intention to anoint the body of Jesus. He has also dropped their concern about the stone, since they were going only to view the tomb. Their early morning expedition thus loses its practical importance, and becomes a mere sentimental visit to the cemetery. (In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, Mary Magdalene and her "friends" would like to do what should be done for the body of Jesus, but decide that if they cannot get into the tomb they will place at the entrance what they have brought for his remembrance, and will weep and wail—an interesting compromise version.)

Unexpectedly the women become witnesses of circumstances attending the resurrection event (unless Jesus is imagined as having issued forth earlier from the sealed tomb; cf. his entering and departing through closed doors, Jn. 20:19 ff.). A great earthquake occurs, an "angel of the Lord" descends from heaven, and drawing near (to the tomb) rolls away the stone and sits upon it. His dazzling appearance is described. Out of fear of him "those guarding (the tomb) quaked and became as dead."

In Mark nothing was said of all this. There the women entered the open tomb and saw the "youth" seated at the right. The resurrection had thus definitely taken place before their arrival; the assumption of Matthew may be that Jesus went forth from the tomb invisibly when the angel moved the stone. The angel now instructs the women, as did "the youth" in Mark. The words differ in part: "*I know* that ye seek Jesus the crucified." (Mk.: "Ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, the crucified.") Matthew adds to the angel's explanation: "He has been raised, just as he said." Since the women are outside the tomb they are invited to *come* (irrespective of the prostrate soldiers) to see the place where he lay (Mk.: see the place where they put him). This invitation, however, is lost sight of, for the angel immediately directs the women to go *quickly* and tell his disciples (the special mention of Peter is omitted). The message about Galilee is then added, but Mark's final "as he said to you" is changed to: "Behold, I say (it) to you." The angel's role has thus assumed much greater dignity than the youth's in Mark. Going away swiftly from the tomb "with fear and great joy" (Mk.: trembling and fright) they ran to make announcement to the disciples (Mk.: they said nothing to anyone).

vv. 9–10 Matthew here adds the first appearance of the risen Lord. While the women were running to do as they were told, Jesus met them, giving them the Greek greeting: *"Chaírete,"* "Rejoice!" (Cf. 26:49. In both cases this is adaptation to the taste of the reader.) The women draw near, take hold of his feet and prostrate themselves before him. (Of a great Jewish teacher, Akiba, it is said that on his return from a long absence his wife and father-in-law prostrated themselves before him and *kissed* his feet. This was evidently a customary way of showing veneration; Matthew has chastely modified kissing of the feet to "taking hold" of them.) The words of Jesus duplicate the message already given by the angel, except that Jesus speaks of his "brethren" rather than of his disciples, but evidently meaning the latter (cf. 12:49 f.). The word was probably chosen with an eye to Ps. 22:22, taken as prophetic of Christ's appearance to his disciples. One or the other of the incidents is thus superfluous. The story of the appearance to the women apparently is a variant of the one that is reported in Jn. 20:11–18, where, it should be noted, no angelic appearance had preceded (Jn. 20:1). But if Jesus appeared to two women at Jerusalem, why should he defer appearing to the disciples until they had returned to Galilee? This perplexing question may have been a factor leading to the cancellation of the Galilean appearances by Luke and the original Gospel of John, and their localization at Jerusalem and its vicinity. Luke, we must observe, excludes an appearance of Christ to the women at or near the tomb on Easter morning (24:22–24). But this story of Matthew operates in the same late manner as Luke with the idea of appearances in the flesh. John, in whose version one of the two women who saw the Lord has been dropped, at least finds it unsuitable for her to whom the vision was accorded to touch Jesus (Jn. 20:17).

MATTHEW'S CONTINUATION

28:11–20

28:11–15 The Fraud of the High Priests and Elders. While the women proceeded on their way, "some of the guard"—whose "as dead" condition (28:4) evidently did not endure for long—brought the news to the high priests. After taking council with the elders, the high priests gave the soldiers abundant money, bidding them to say that his (Jesus') disciples came by night and stole the body while they slept. The high priests also promised that if the governor heard of it they would calm him and would make them (appear) blameless. (A "decree of Caesar"—probably Augustus—reported on an inscription from Nazareth, had made tomb-robbery, and particularly removal of a body, a crime punishable with death.) The soldiers took the money and did as they were instructed. And that is how "this word" (= story) was spread among the Jews "until today." This final phrase is significant. It reflects both a late standpoint of the author and the long existence of a widespread Jewish claim that the body of Jesus was stolen by his disciples. It opens up a vista of extended controversy. The earliest accounts of the appearances of Christ, as these may be reconstructed on the basis of Paul (especially 1 Cor. 15), did not make anything of an empty tomb, for Jesus rose in a "glorified body." The empty tomb story, it seems probable, came later, first appearing on the scene in Mark. It was soon used for apologetic purposes, however, and then elicited the Jewish claim that the disciples had stolen the body. This in turn was met by the story that the tomb was sealed and guarded, and that neutral persons such as the soldiers had been present when the stone was rolled away. These witnesses of the resurrection had, Matthew asserts, been bribed by the hierarchy to maintain the Jewish claim. In Paul's time the Jewish contention must have been that the supposed appearances of Christ were hallucinations.

28:16–20 The Revelation of the Risen Christ in Galilee. Matthew retained Mark's prediction that the disciples would see Jesus in Galilee, and supplies a report of such an appearance. It is apparently a counterpart of the one localized at Jerusalem in Lk. 24:36 f. and Jn. 20:19–29 (where the appearance is artificially duplicated, owing to Thomas), but is more impressive. A staging is provided: the eleven went "to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them." This remark must be dependent on a version of events in which a mountain was mentioned as rendezvous, which is not the case in 26:32 or in Mk. 14:28. Whether Galilean Christians remembered the exact mountain is then the question. The mount of the Transfiguration (17:1) could well be meant—in view of the likelihood that the Transfiguration story was derived from an Easter vision (cf. on Mk. 9:2–8)—and the allusion to it as the "holy mount" in 2 Pet. 1:18 lends support to the idea. On the other hand, one is reminded of Mk. 3:13, where Jesus ascends a mountain and calls to him whom he wishes that *they* should be with *him* and that he might send them forth to preach. The latter function is now about to be assigned afresh, and his promise that *he* will be with *them* is coupled with it. The mountainside above the Lake of Galilee could thus be meant.

When they saw Jesus they prostrated themselves, "but some doubted." The latter remark is not to be construed as a dependable historical element in the narrative, but as apologetics. The further removed from the true facts the stories are, the more this idea is stressed. Those who, like Paul, had really seen the Lord did not doubt. We find this motif in Lk. 24: 11, 25, 37 f., 41 and in Jn. 20:25 f. The later conclusion of Mark has it in 16:11, 13, 14. In the apocryphal Epistle of the Apostles the matter is carried to an extreme: all the disciples refuse to believe and can be persuaded only with much effort.

Jesus, whom the eleven first must have seen a short distance off, now approaches them and without a salutation declares, that to him is given "all power in heaven and on earth." He thus is world-ruler (Gr. *Kosmokrátōr*). In 25:31 the coming Son of man is going to occupy the seat, which in Dan. 7:13 belonged to the Ancient of Days. Here he is viewed as God's representative, as the Son to whom the Father gladly gives full authority to act for him.

This declaration about his authority is followed by the triple charge to the eleven:

1. "Going forth, therefore, make ye disciples of (= convert to Christianity) all peoples." The mission among the Gentiles is here attributed to a command of the parting Christ. It was not something that the Hellenists had foisted on the reluctant original disciples; they themselves had received it from the Lord. The Jewish-Christian group represented by Matthew has thus accommodated itself to the facts of the historical development. The success of the Gentile mission work through the vast efforts of Paul has made it the obvious will of the Lord. And this Jewish-Christian Gospel now gives it a tremendous additional impetus. Out of this saying grew the apocryphal acts dealing with travels of the Apostles, if it does not already presuppose predecessors of these.

2. "Baptizing them." Nowhere else is it said that Jesus commanded baptism. The rite was introduced into Christianity in the early days, perhaps for the purpose of attracting the followers of John the Baptist. That some of Jesus' disciples had come from that quarter is assumed in Jn. 1:37. The baptism is *"into* the name of," which means more than *"in* the name of"; it signifies that the one baptized enters into a relation of belonging to the person whose name is mentioned over him at the occasion. One would expect this name to be that of Jesus and it is surprising to find the text continuing with "the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," which are no names at all. The suspicion that this is not what Matthew originally wrote naturally arises. In "Father, Son and Holy Ghost" we have the Trinitarian formula (though perhaps not yet understood in the full Trinitarian sense) which was associated with Christian baptism in the second century, as evidenced in the Didache, ch. 7. The change in the text of Matthew could have been made to provide biblical authority for the ecclesiastical custom. True, the manuscripts give full support to the present text, but we as yet have no early second-century papyrus witness, which alone could bring decisive proof. There is, however, significant patristic support for the belief in a change: Eusebius in his writings *antedating* the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) always quotes the passage thus: "Going forth make ye disciples of all nations in my name." He has no baptismal command or Trinitarian formula.

3. "Teaching them to keep all things, whatever I commanded you." Matthew's original emphasis, as we have seen, was directed toward obedience to the Law as interpreted by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, and with this the text in Eusebius' form would fully agree. A kind of Christianity was to be taught which conformed very much to Jewish ideals, purified of Pharisaic legalism. For this task the disciples (and this no doubt includes their successors and pupils) were given the comforting assurance of Christ's presence with them all the days to the end of the (present) world age. An apocalyptically minded Primitive Christianity is giving way to a Church enjoying the constant presence of its Lord, and hence not greatly disturbed by the postponement in his visible Second Coming.

Through the introduction of the baptismal command an important modification of this Matthean Christianity was effected. People were made Christians by baptism, and the teaching of Christ's commandments was made secondary. The Trinitarian formula pushed the emphasis in the direction of the acceptance of dogma. Thus was established the format of ecclesiastical Christianity as we know it, seemingly endorsed by the risen Christ himself.

Whether this powerful closing scene of the Gospel according to Matthew gives us the story of the appearance of Christ in a form akin to that in which Mark knew it is uncertain. The rich knowledge of appearances of the risen Lord, which was available to Paul (1 Cor. 15:5–8), had apparently shrunk to, at best, two Galilean ones for Mark (16:7). We here have a reduction to a single Galilean one, for Matthew knows nothing of a special appearance to Peter such as was still remembered in other quarters (Lk. 24:34) or of any special role of Peter (Jn. 21) in connection with this appearance before the eleven. The only thing that remains is memory of the *fact* of a Galilean appearance. The place of the appearance to Peter has been usurped by that to the two Marys on Easter morn.

The Gospel according to Luke

The Sources

In his prologue, 1:1–4, Luke reveals that he had predecessors, but gives no hint of being dependent on them. He is ostensibly dipping into the reservoir of oral tradition, and presenting an account that he thinks is superior to earlier ones, notably in its chronological arrangement. This Prologue is that of a Hellenistic historical writer, and is intended to convey the impression to the reader that he writes both objectively and authoritatively. He does not, however, reveal all the secrets of his trade—above all, not that he used his predecessors' writings as a mine of information. It was left for nineteenth-century criticism of the Gospels to determine some of his sources.

There is an advantage in imagining the origin of this Gospel as analogous to that of Matthew: a compilation made from Mark, Q and special materials of unknown derivation. But whereas Matthew contains 90 per cent of Mark, Luke contains only 51 per cent. Luke, furthermore, has extensive special material, notably in his central section, 9:51–18:14, plus his Infancy narrative, chs. 1–2, and his addition to the post-resurrection narrative, 24:13–53. He also differs so much from Mark in his Passion narrative that his dependence on Mark in that area becomes dubious. If it be independent, then about two-thirds of the Gospel is composed of special material and Q. It is quite possible, therefore, that this Gospel had a more complicated origin than Matthew's.

Streeter's Proto-Luke theory (1924) imagines the work as evolving from a nucleus composed of a combination of Q and L (Luke's special material), with narrative blocks from Mark's Gospel interpolated later (4:31–44; 5:12–6:19; 8:4–9:50; 18:15–43; 19:28–36; 19:45–21:33; 21:37–22:13). Mark's order was retained, with two exceptions (6:17–19; 8:19–21). It is unlikely that the Infancy narratives were a part of Proto-Luke, because 3:1–2 seems to have been the beginning of that work, and because the genealogy of Jesus (3:23b–38), which stands between the Baptism and the Temptation, would have been put with the Infancy narratives by an author bent on starting with that subject matter (cf. Mt.). Presumably, they were added in the final editing of the book, as were the post-resurrection stories. This Proto-Luke theory, however, is still in the discussion stage, and bearing in mind the fate of the Proto-Mark theories, it seems best to defer final judgment concerning it. It may well be asked whether the observations underlying it do not merely point to the process carried on by an individual author in composing his book. Current interest is directed more to the idea of a single author-editor and to the recovery of his distinctive theological viewpoint. If such a viewpoint appears consistently in the whole work, then this Gospel's origin in successive stages becomes doubtful.

The Purpose of Luke

Ostensibly, Luke is writing his work for a certain Theophilus. However, the dedication of a book to some prominent person was a common thing. Pliny dedicated his *Natural History* to the Emperor Vespasian; Dionysius of Halicarnassus inscribed his work on the *Ancient Orators* to a man named Ammaios. Such dedications cannot obscure that the author sought a wider audience. Luke wrote for Christian readers, for it is incredible that he would have gone to all this trouble for a pagan. They already had certain Christian writings, e.g., Mark and Q, and Luke's purpose evidently was to replace these with something combining their substance. He also wanted to emphasize some things more and others less or differently as well as to omit some materials and add others. He sought to give the Church of his time and place the sacred story and the teachings of Jesus in a manner suited to its life and faith.

Some scholars incline to the belief that Luke from the beginning planned to write a work in two parts—the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. They then interpret the prologue as introductory to the whole. The matter may be dealt with more suitably in the Introduction to Acts. When the standpoint of the Gospel is clearly understood it makes little difference how one answers this question.

The Standpoint of Luke

An important concern of all three Synoptic Gospels is the problem of the postponement of the Second Coming of Christ. Mark and Matthew provide explanations for the delay, but still entertain the hope of its proximity. Luke, however, really comes to grips with the problem, and finds a solution for it that did not need revision for the general Christian public. His predecessors thought in terms of the present world and the world to come. Luke pushes the world to come into the distance and introduces a division of the present world-order into three periods: (1) the time of the Law and the Prophets, ending with John (16:16); (2) the central period: the time of the ministry of Jesus, his teaching and his acts (Acts 1:2); (3) the time since his ascension to heaven, which will end with his return, the day and hour of which one should not speculate about (Acts 1:7). It is as though all light were focused on the central period. Toward it the ages had tended, from it have gone forth all the impulses operative in the life of the Church. Jesus, instead of preaching an apocalyptic message as in Mark when he returned to Galilee (Mk. 1:15), proclaimed the importance of the hour of his appearance as the time of the fulfillment of prophecy, and presented a program for his ministry based on Is. 61 (Lk. 4:16 f.). John the Baptist becomes a historical figure—the allusions to his being the expected Elijah are omitted. Luke invokes the glamour of Old Testament Messianism in the Infancy narrative, and has the disciples share the limited horizon of the ancient hope (24:21; Acts 1:6). He even toys with the title "king" at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (19:38). But all this is meant only symbolically. He portrays the disciples as mistaken in their belief that the kingdom was at hand when they went up to Jerusalem (19:11). The Way of the Cross was divinely ordained for Jesus, but it is not interpreted as an atonement, as in Mark. The disciples are to preach repentance and the forgiveness of sins (24:47). Jesus as Son of man is not the one who holds the Last Judgment, but rather the present intercessor with God (12:8 f.). The eschatological prophecies are retained and revised, but since their fulfillment is not in prospect in the near future, they take on the nature of a doctrine of the last things.

If the end is far off, then the problem of life in the world has to be faced. Luke thus gives much weight to ethics. Christians are meeting hostility, and "endurance" is a leading virtue (8:15; 21:19). The perils of worldly wealth are stressed. He portrays Jesus' sympathy with the poor and the downtrodden, the suffering and the bereaved, publicans and sinners, Samaritans and Gentiles. He depicts women as among the Lord's most devoted followers. Indeed, the Infancy stories with their maternalism (fateful because it led to one of the most controversial developments in Catholic dogma) seem to have been included especially to please Hellenistic women readers.

That Luke wrote for Gentiles is apparent from numerous indications in the Gospel, and of course becomes fully vivid in its continuation in Acts. As early as his programmatic address at Nazareth, Jesus envisions the passing of the message to the Gentiles (4:25 f.); and his parting words on Olivet (24:47) emphasize its world-wide scope. Luke therefore deletes Aramaic phrases and names of localities given by Mark, and anything that might seem queer or out of place to Gentile readers.

In connection with such an audience, the relation of Christianity to the Roman state was of paramount concern. A ticklish point was the fact that Jesus had been crucified under the Roman governor of Palestine. Luke treads very lightly here. The demand for the crucifixion of Jesus came from the Jews, with their Synedrium taking the lead, and thus it could not be blamed merely on the high priests. Pilate, though he tried his best to wriggle out of the situation, had to yield to popular clamor and hand Jesus over for crucifixion. Roman soldiers were hardly involved in any way, and committed no brutality. A few were misled into mocking Jesus (23:36), but this is quickly offset by the testimony of the centurion (23:47). When we glance forward to Luke's second book, the Acts of the Apostles, and see how he refrains from relating the story of the deaths of Paul and Peter, but closes with a scene showing how kindly Paul was treated at Rome, it becomes quite clear that he is anxiously seeking to give Christianity a standing as a religion which the Roman state can safely tolerate. He is bent on deleting the Galilean origins of the Church, perhaps in part because "Galilean" was a common designation for the Zealots who had caused Rome so much trouble.

The Date of the Gospel

The Gospel clearly looks back on the fall of Jerusalem (19:43f.; 21:20, 24). Mark was written around A.D. 68–70, and because Luke used Mark, a date allowing for some lapse of time must be assumed. Christians are not yet suffering serious persecution from the Romans, and so the period prior to that of Domitian (A.D. 95) seems to be indicated. One may infer from 24:13–35 that the Jerusalem church is re-established in the Holy City under the leadership of a kinsman of

Jesus. In general, a date in the late eighties or early nineties would suit the evidence best.

The Author

The ecclesiastical title ascribes the Gospel to one Luke. There is more reason to put some reliance in it than is the case with other Gospel titles, for in view of its Hellenistic type of introduction it must have had a title and have borne the name of its author when first written, e.g., *Luke's Acts of Jesus.* Tradition claimed that Paul's helper, the physician Luke (Gr. *Loukás,* a shortened form of *Loukános*) of Col. 4:14, Philem. 1:24, and 2 Tim. 4:11, is the man meant. This Luke was apparently a Gentile, for in Col. 4:10–11, Paul first mentions his Jewish-Christian co-workers, one of whom is John Mark, and then in vv. 12 f. sends greetings from a separate group, which includes Luke. Eusebius does not quote anything about Luke from Papias, and what he gives from Irenaeus or says on his own account is mainly an attempt to cover Luke's Gospel with the authority of Paul. He does add one scrap of information which is new, viz., that Luke was a native of Antioch (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 4). Perhaps he was so designated in the original title. Some have argued that the third Gospel uses terminology found in Greek medical writers, and find therein confirmation of its authorship by a physician. However, the expressions are not technical enough to prove anything. The second-century Canon Muratori, written in corrupt Latin, says that Paul took Luke along on his travels as "studious of the law" (Lat. *studiosus juris,* a phrase that most scholars seek to get rid of by means of text emendations such as *itineris,* "way," for *juris*). Jerome in the fourth century claims that Luke wrote the Gospel in Achaea and Boeotia and that he died in the latter region, at Thebes. The Monarchian Prologues, representing fourth-century tradition, assert that he was unmarried, lived to be seventy-four years old, and died in Bithynia in Asia Minor. The uncertainty of origin and the contradictoriness of these reports makes one wary of them.

Since the author of the Gospel also wrote Acts, the question of the authorship of the Gospel must be left in abeyance until that of Acts is considered. On the basis of the Gospel alone, one might be inclined to accept the tradition.

LUKE

THE INFANCY NARRATIVE

1:1–2:52

1:1–4 The Prologue. In a prologue conforming to Hellenistic style and taste, Luke refers to "the events that have been fulfilled (= have taken place) among us (i.e., the Christian group), as they have been handed down to us by those who were eyewitnesses and servants of the Word from the beginning." "The Word" is of course the Word of God, used as term for the Christian message, of which the account of what Jesus Christ said and did was an essential part. The eyewitnesses of the Word are thus the eyewitnesses of Christ, first of all the Twelve, but then also the Seventy (10:1). The designation "servants" (Gr. *hypērétai*) is added to describe more adequately the role of all these men as no mere onlookers, but as actively concerned with the spreading of the Christian message. Perhaps at the same time it broadens the base to include persons like Barnabas and Paul, who had not been eyewitnesses from the beginning. (If Mark is called the servant of Barnabas and Paul, Acts 13:5, this hardly warrants the assumption that "servant" here means a lower class of persons than the eyewitnesses.) The allusion to "the events that have taken place among us" may be regarded as a neutral reference to the story of Jesus, and thus as expressive of a historian's objective posture. The author does not say that he personally knew any of the eyewitnesses—though he may have—but only that they are the fountainhead of the tradition he is reporting.

Since many had already undertaken to set up a narrative concerning these happenings (the eyewitnesses having left no written records), it seemed to the author that he, also, as one who had followed (i.e., investigated) all things meticulously from the beginning (after the manner of a responsible historian), should write them down in sequence (Gr. *kathexēs*)—which the other writers evidently had not done—for the individual to whom he is dedicating his book. He calls the man he is honoring "most excellent Theophilus," using a complimentary word with which one addressed high officials (cf. Acts 23:26; 24:3; 26:5) or other important personages. Thus Josephus in dedicating his *Antiquities* to a freedman of the emperor calls him "most excellent of men, Epaphroditus" (*Vita,* 76; cf. also *Against Apion, 1,* 1). Luke desires that Theophilus should know the certainty of the words (teachings) concerning which he has been "taught" (i.e., see on how firm a foundation they rest). In view of the same author's use of the verb in the sense of "teach" in Acts 18:25, it does not seem certain that it should be translated as "informed" (which would make it possible to consider Theophilus an unconverted man, perhaps even an official to whom Luke was submitting facts about Christianity). The natural thing is to suppose that he was a Christian of high station who encouraged Luke to write, just as Epaphroditus encouraged Josephus (*Ant.,* Preface, 2). Dedicating a book to such a man was quite customary. If he were well known it had the advantage of securing greater attention for it. If he were wealthy, an author could hope that he would underwrite the cost of its distribution. (Cf. also above p. 192.)

1:5–25 The Prediction of the Birth of John. The material that follows is not written in the good Hellenistic style of which the author shows himself capable in 1:1–4, but in a manner suggesting that it was translated from the Hebrew. As no effort is made to put it into more literary Greek, one may assume that Luke was treating a received excerpt reverently. He first relates a happening under Herod, king of "Judaea" (the term used in the broad sense for the kingdom). He cannot give the year, or any contemporary event to fix the time more precisely. The elderly Zacharias, a priest of the order of Abia (or Abijah, no. eight of the twenty-four orders of priests listed in 1 Chron. 24), was carrying out his (semiannual) assignment of (a week's) service in the Temple. His wife, Elizabeth, mentioned because of what follows, was also from a priestly family and bore the same name as Aaron's wife, Elisheba (Ex. 6:23; LXX: Elisabet). In typical Old Testament language, both are described as "righteous" before God, walking blamelessly in the Commandments and the statutes (Gen. 26:5). But they were childless—a great sorrow—and both advanced in years. It is not made clear why Zacharias did not marry another wife, like Elkanah of old (1 Sam. 1:2). Perhaps his being a priest prevented him; while no law about the matter has been preserved, custom may have forbidden it. According to *Herod. 1,* 80, Egyptian priests could marry only one wife.

According to Talmudic sources the particular daily activities of the priests were determined by a lottery, which was directed by an official appointed to handle that matter. (More ancient light on the subject may be forthcoming from Qumran fragments of a work called *Mishmārōth,* which lists assignments of priestly families.) Zacharias and other priests of his order started their week of service on a Sabbath with the evening sacrifice. One of the daily sacrifices was of incense, and by lot this had fallen to Zacharias. It preceded the burnt sacrifice (which was brought on the great altar in front of the "house," the adyton in the innermost temple-court) in the morning, but followed it in the evening. An evening occasion would seem to be meant here in view of v. 21. The golden incense-altar on which the sacrifice was brought was in the "house" itself, but in the outer or eastern part of it—the inner or western part being the Holy of Holies. Zacharias in bringing this sacrifice, therefore, had to go behind the curtain (23:45) while the crowd in the Court of the Israelites was praying. When he was officiating, Zacharias saw an angel of the Lord standing to the right of the altar of incense. It is noteworthy that the angel appears realistically, while in Mt. 1:20 f., he appears only in dreams. Zacharias is frightened, but the angel bids him not to fear (cf. Judg. 6:23). His prayer (for the coming redemption of Israel—he would hardly have prayed for a child) has been heard. His wife will bear a son whom he is to call John, and the birth of this son will spell joy not only to him but to "many" (i.e., John's future followers). He will be great "before the Lord" (cf. Nimrod, Gen. 10:9); he shall not touch wine or strong drink. (He is evidently to be a Nazirite, cf. Num. 6:3, but is not forbidden to cut his hair and hence is not, in the terminology of the Mishnah, a "Samson Nazirite," but a "Nazirite forever," who was permitted to cut his hair.) He is to be filled with Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 2:4) from (i.e., while still in) his mother's womb (so understood by the Old Syriac translator; others "from birth." In effect, this is not much different from being begotten by the Holy Spirit.) He will convert many (now religiously indifferent) Israelites to their God, and so he—and no other—will become the Lord's messenger of Mal. 3:1 and 4:5 (the latter passage, predicting a return in person of Elijah, being weakened to mean that someone should come who had the spirit and power of Elijah). He will attain the objective set for the forerunner —preparing for the Lord ('s arrival) a properly readied people by carrying out Mal. 4:6 (cf. Ecclus. 48:10).

Zacharias, like Hezekiah (2 Kings 20:8), requests a confirmatory sign, in view of his and his wife's age. The angel declares he is Gabriel (Dan. 8:16; 9:21), "who stands before God" (which should be enough to guarantee his word). In the developed angelology of this period there were archangels (rabbinic texts: "throne angels") who stood in the immediate presence of God; Michael and Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael are the leading ones, the second being much concerned with the weal and woe of Israel. The element of fire is especially associated with him, and he executes the divine judgments of wrath. This gave him the aspect of being the "hardest angel." In an event like this, affecting the welfare of God's people, he was the proper messenger. But his sternness is revealed in his punishment of Zacharias: the mouth that expressed doubt in asking for a sign will be struck dumb until the angel's words are fulfilled. The departure of the angel is not mentioned (cf. 1:38).

Zacharias, whose lingering behind the curtain evoked some wonder on the part of those forced to lengthen their prayers (by repetition?), finally came out. As he seemed unable to speak, the people inferred that he must have seen a vision and was temporarily overcome. He motioned to them (trying to give some explanation?), but his speech did not return and so it became clear that he had lost it. No mention is made of the interpretation that the public placed on this (: divine punishment?).

After he returned to his home—no hint is given where that may have been, but cf. v. 39—his wife became pregnant. She hid herself for five months. One might think that this was to escape being talked about (cf. Gen. 17:17), but the explanation given reveals exaltation of soul. "For she said: thus has the Lord done to me (by letting me become pregnant) in days in which he mercifully looked down (Acts 4:29) to remove my disgrace (of barrenness) among people." The duration of the concealment is due to the next incident, for it is eminently appropriate that Mary should be the first to hear from Elizabeth's lips the news of her pregnancy (cf. below). The "chronology" is necessary in view of v. 41, for a babe does not stir in the womb before the beginning of the second half of the pregnancy period.

1:26–38 The Annunciation. Into the story of the Baptist's origins (continued in v. 57–80) Luke has interpolated that of the Annunciation, thus tying the originally separate John and Jesus Nativity cycles together by easily discernible artifices. We have just mentioned one—the five-month concealment of Elizabeth. Another link of this nature appears immediately in v. 26—the mention of the "sixth month" (i.e., of the pregnancy of Elizabeth). The story proceeds objectively to relate how Gabriel was sent by God to a virgin named Mary [who was betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph] out of the house of David. (On the bracketed words cf. below.) The angel enters with a salutation, "Greetings, O thou on whom grace has been bestowed (cf. Eph. 1:6), the Lord (is) with thee" (Judg. 6:12). Some mss. add: "thou blessed among women."

The greeting confuses the virgin, who does not comprehend what it means. The angel reassures her, and clarifies his mysterious greeting. She has found grace with God. She is to become pregnant and bear a son whom she is to call Jesus. This one will be great (omitting "before the Lord," cf. v. 14), and will (even) be called son of "the highest" (Gr. *hýpsistos,* cf. 6:35; LXX expression, cf. Gen. 14:22; in the third century A.D. pagans worshiped a Zeus Hypsistos in Syria). God will give him the Davidic throne and he will rule forever over the house of Jacob. (It is peculiar that Old Testament Messianism is utilized here, since Jesus did not fulfill any of this in the literal meaning of the words; one must assume that the Christian narrator takes all this as figurative language and sees a fulfillment of it on a higher plane.)

Mary now raises the innocent question of how she can become a mother, not (sexually) "knowing" a man (cf. Gen. 4:1)? The question is surprising if her marriage impends, as v. 27 implies. An engaged maiden would naturally have construed this prediction as one that was to be fulfilled after her marriage. The remark is appropriate only if Mary is not betrothed. Indeed, the entire shift in focus as compared with Matthew is puzzling. There Joseph is the one who is enlightened by the angel and is told to wed Mary and name the child, whereas here it is Mary who receives the revelation and is told to name the child. Indeed, the view has been advanced that the words bracketed above are an addition by Luke, and that the story as originally received by him dealt with the birth of Jesus by an unwed mother who was of the house of David. However that may be, the tale suggests influence from the side of Hellenistic romancers, who catered to women readers by bringing girls and women into the limelight.

The angel's reply to the maiden's question is mysterious: "Holy Spirit will come over thee" (cf. Acts 1:8). The Spirit is imagined as impersonal here, as the Hebraic type of parallelism of the next clause shows: "*Power* of the Most High will overshadow thee." The conclusion is: "Therefore the holy that is (thus) begotten (Mt. 1:20) will be called 'Son of God.'" The story in Matthew likewise attributes Mary's pregnancy to Holy Spirit (Mt. 1:20), but refrains from any elaboration, such as is given here. The "overshadowing" is like that of the cloud of Ex. 40:35, LXX. In the Transfiguration scene, too, the cloud "overshadows" the disciples (9:34), and is closely connected with the divine presence. Mythical ideas of procreation of men by divinities, which even influenced a Jew like Philo (see p. 121) have found here a purified echo. That the begotten one is "holy" is the very first thought, for holiness is the basic quality of the divinity and of divine Spirit. "Son of God" is here explained as meaning sonship by procreation— not by adoption, as the older view in Ps. 2:7 and originally in the narrative of the Baptism (3:22) presupposed.

While Mary has not asked for a sign, as Zacharias did (1:18), the angel of his own accord gives her one to alleviate the disturbance his message causes her. He tells her of her "kinswoman" Elizabeth (probably a secondarily established relationship, as John the Baptist knows nothing of Jesus; Jn. 1:31). She has conceived in her old age and this is (already) the sixth month (of pregnancy) for her (who was) called "barren." That is a miracle, which Mary can verify and which will show her that "not will any word (= thing) be powerless (= impossible, Mt. 17:20) with God" (phraseology of Gen. 18:14, LXX, with minor changes). Mary responds with proper subservience: she is the Lord's handmaiden. May it happen to her according to the angel's word! In this instance the angel's departure is specifically mentioned.

1:39–56 Mary Visits Elizabeth; the Magnificat. For the purpose of seeing the indicated sign at first hand, Mary goes to visit Elizabeth. The assumption that the women were related was necessary to explain the visit. Were the report of such kinship dependable it would imply that Mary, too, was imagined here as being of the daughters of Aaron.

Allegedly Mary arose and hastened to the hill country—a term for the mountainous region round Jerusalem and southward to beyond Hebron, uttered from a Jerusalem rather than Galilean point of view. She went to "a city of Judah." Some would render "province of Judaea" on the basis of a hypothetical Aramaic phrase; but this is improbable because the name Judah rather than Judaea is used (LXX language, cf. LXX, Jer. 9:11; contrast Bethlehem of Judaea, Mt. 2:1), and because Judaea was no province at this period. It seems probable that a city name was originally mentioned (a city of Judah *called X*) but was dropped. If the city was Beth-zacharias (1 Macc. 6:32 ff.) southwest of Bethlehem, one could see a very good reason for this; the storyteller would have derived the name of the man from the city and would have hidden the fact by omission of the city's name. (The old suggestion that Judah is an error for the priestly city of Juttah, Josh. 21:16, is improbable because that place was now in Idumaean territory.)

The idea of a thirteen-year-old female (see p. 120) going from Nazareth across hostile Samaria to some place in the Judaean hill country seems extremely improbable under conditions of Jewish life, even if one invents suitable protection. Again one must suspect the influence of Hellenistic romances, in which women travel even in risqué situations.

Arriving at the city, whatever its name, Mary entered Zacharias' house and greeted Elizabeth. The babe in the latter's womb leaped (for joy, v. 44; cf. 6:23) at the greeting—thereby indicating that it was acclaiming the mother of him of whom it was to be the precursor. Elizabeth recognized this, and full of Holy Spirit greeted Mary in a loud voice: "Blessed (= praised) among women (cf. Judg. 5:24) art thou, and blessed be the fruit of thy womb" (cf. Gen. 30:2). Whence does it (i.e., the honor) come to her to receive a visit from the mother of "her Lord" (cf. Ps. 110:1; i.e., the Messiah)? (She felt unworthy of such a royal visit; cf. 2 Sam. 24:21). And she imparted to Mary the information about the babe in her womb leaping for joy at Mary's greeting. Blessed ("happy," different word than in v. 42) is she who (unlike her husband Zacharias, 1:18) believed that there would be fulfillment of the things said to her by the Lord (God, through his angel).

This inspired salutation elicits an inspired response. In archaic, sacred-narrative style (cf. 1 Sam. 2:1–10) Mary is made to utter a psalm, which in the Latin Bible translation starts with the word "Magnificat." This has come to be the familiar identifying name for the poem. Luke no doubt culled the psalm from a hymn collection similar to the Thanksgiving Hymns (*Hōdāyōth*) found among the Dead Sea scrolls, merely injecting a single verse to suit his special purpose. It is, like other productions of late Jewish psalmody, a mosaic of scriptural allusions.

The speaker's soul and spirit (nearly synonymous terms) are both actively engaged: the one glorifies the Lord (= Yahweh) the other rejoices in God "my savior" (Gr. sōtḗr; cf. Hab. 3:18, LXX). At this point Luke interpolated v. 48: "for he has looked on the lowliness of his handmaiden (cf. 1 Sam. 1:11, LXX). Behold from now on all generations will call me blessed" (Gen. 30:13, LXX). This addition gave the poem relevance and enduring life, and vastly helped the cause of future Mariolatry.

The original psalmist continued in v. 49 with the reason for rejoicing that had occupied him in v. 47: for the mighty one (God) has done great things to him (perhaps delivering him out of trouble). He affirms his faith in the constancy of God's mercy toward those that fear him; alludes to a powerful action, whereby He scattered those arrogant in their mental attitude (a reference to some forgotten situation of discomfiture of an obnoxious group); calls to mind past experiences of dethronement of kings and exaltation of the lowly as well as of God's provision for the good (= the poor) and nonprovision for the rich. A final statement affirms that God has taken the part of his servant Israel, remembering his (promise of) eternal mercy to Abraham and his seed, as he had declared (repeatedly) to the fathers. The poet evidently regarded some contemporary occurrence in the political sphere as manifestation of God's mercy toward his people.

Mary stayed with Elizabeth about three months—the "about" probably suggests a bit of uncertainty concerning the previous sixth-month date (1:26), for Mary had to leave before Elizabeth's child was born. (It would have occasioned difficulty for the narrator to have her present in 1:57–79. By getting rid of her, he could follow the story of John as he had received it.) When Mary's own pregnancy began is not stated, but v. 43 suggests it was before the visit to Elizabeth. It was believed later on that Jesus was six months younger than John, and this (in view of Jn. 3:30 and solar symbolism) found expression in putting John's birthday at the summer solstice; Jesus', right after the winter solstice. What the relative ages of Jesus and John actually were cannot be regarded as reliably reflected by these stories.

1:57–80 The Birth of John

vv. 57–66 We revert here to the sequel of 1:1–24—the narrative about John's birth. These materials doubtless were completely independent originally and were received from followers of the Baptist, who had begun to have a biographical interest in their sect's founder, just as Christians had in theirs. Luke has created a bridge between the two Nativity cycles by means of 1:36–37 and 1:39–56.

Elizabeth's bearing a son led neighbors and relatives who heard about it to rejoice with her. The birth is piously viewed as a great act of mercy done her by the Lord. (The language indicates no such miraculous happening as in the case of Sarah, Gen. 18:11.) On the eighth day, as was customary, the child was circumcised and they (the relatives) called it "Zacharias" after the name of its father. (In Ruth 4:17, the female neighbors name the child. It was not general practice to name a son after his father, but it did occur, cf. Josephus, who has in his pedigree a Matthias son of a Matthias, though each of them has a surname for differentiation, *Vita,* *1,* 1.) But the child's mother objected and declared he was to be called John. This occasioned surprise, since there was no one of that name in the family. The father was appealed to; he asked for a writing tablet (usually made of wood and covered with wax, on which one scratched the writing with a stylus), and wrote that the boy's name should be John. This occasioned astonishment—a peculiar circumstance, suggesting that Elizabeth had offered this name without her husband's knowledge. Immediately thereafter Zacharias' mouth was opened, and his tongue (add: was loosed) and he spoke, praising God. The punishment imposed by Gabriel thus terminated with fulfillment of the command of 1:13. Fear (of God) came upon the neighbors, and all these matters were talked about in the hill country of Judaea. All who heard them put them in their hearts (= minds; for further consideration cf. 1 Sam. 21:12, LXX). Under the circumstances they expected great things of the child. The words, "for the hand of the Lord was with him" (cf. Acts 11:21), evidently look ahead, but view the beginning of John's existence as illustrative of the special providence attending him.

vv. 67–79 Like an afterthought to the preceding story, perhaps elicited by the remark of Zacharias' praising God in v. 64, there then appears another incident. The old priest, filled with holy spirit, prophesies. What he utters is a psalm, which in the Latin Bible starts with the word *Benedictus,* and so has become known by that designation. Again we may be certain that Luke did not improvise this poem. The question can only be: did he take it from a psalm book and adapt it as he had the Magnificat, or was it already part of the received material about John the Baptist? In the latter case we would here have a piece of the hymnody of the Baptist sect.

The speaker blesses the Lord (i.e., Yahweh) the God of Israel (Ps. 41:14) for his visiting and making a redemption for his people (in a certain event): he has raised up for them a horn of salvation (1 Sam. 2:10) in the house of David his servant. Therein he has fulfilled the prophecies spoken since of old through the mouth of his holy prophets, promising salvation from foes and from all those hating them, and the doing of mercy with the fathers (by showing favor to their descendants), and the remembering of his holy Covenant—the oath he swore to grant: that their descendants, snatched out of the hand of enemies, should fearlessly worship in holiness and justice before him all their days.

This presumably older material has been provided with a continuation in vv. 76 f. hailing the infant John: he will be called "prophet of the Most High" and will go before the face of the Lord (= Yahweh) to prepare his paths (Mal. 3:1), with the consequence of giving knowledge of salvation to his people in (= through) forgiveness of their sins. (All this will take place) through the tender mercy of our God, through which the rising (like that of the sun, Mal. 4:2) from on high visited us (Codices S and B: will visit us), to appear (Acts 27:20) to those sitting in darkness and shadow of death (Is. 9:2) to guide our feet to a way of peace (i.e., leading to welfare).

The introduction hailing an event in the house of David seems inconsistent with the sequel. It is probably a snatch of earlier poetry written from a dynastic standpoint. Whoever first utilized it—whether Luke or a Baptist sectarian—may have understood "house of David" geographically, as meaning Judaea, rather than literally (cf. the Assyrian "House of Omri" as a designation for Israel). In view of the Zacharias story of 1:5–25 it is hardly possible to suppose that John was considered a Davidic descendant.

In the picture set up in vv. 76 ff. there is no room for Jesus. The theocratic line of the coming salvation is followed, as in Mal. 3:1. John is the prophet who precedes the coming deity. (Luke evidently interpreted "Lord" to mean Christ, but therein was mistaken.) He is not represented as an Elijah, but as one who brought knowledge of salvation (a Gnostic tinge of thought) through forgiveness of sins. Christians would hardly have spoken so exaggeratedly of John. Luke has evidently appropriated what John's followers claimed for him. To them, he and not Jesus was the revealer of God. So intrigued was Luke by the pious Semitic phrases and so inclined to take some things poetically that he did not see the basic tension existing between the line of material glorifying John as the man of destiny and that glorifying Jesus, but combined them both.

v. 80 The Infancy story of John ended with a transitional verse leading over to his manhood. Luke puts it here, even though chronologically he might well have introduced 2:1–40 first. But it would have been less pleasing to have combined it with the episode of the boy Jesus in 2:41 f. He notes that John grew physically and at the same time grew strong in spirit (= intellect and will, not the same as "becoming strong through the Spirit," Eph. 3:16); the prediction of 1:15 that he will be filled with Holy Spirit from his prenatal state on is not followed up here. But significant is the report that he *was in the desert places until the day of his "manifestation"* (Gr. *anádeixis*)—a term used by Hellenistic writers for an official's initial public appearance—to Israel. If the youth sought a life in the desert places, this suggests his retiring to the wilderness of Judah, which comprised the inclines to the Dead Sea for anyone living in a "city of Judah." Since individual hermit life apparently was unknown prior to the third century A.D., it seems attractive to assume that John for a time joined a colony like that of the Essenes in the Dead Sea neighborhood. His "manifestation" certainly took place in the Jordan valley a few miles from there. It is worthy of note that the people of Qumran, too, were in the wilderness to prepare the way of the Lord (by the study of the law), according to the Qumran Rule of the Community (*8,* 13 f.).

2:1–20 The Birth of Jesus. A new story is tacked on with "it came to pass in those days" (cf. Ex. 2:11; Judg. 18:1; 19:1)—a simple narrative introduction that is not to be taken literally, but is a confession of ignorance as to the exact time of what is related. A decree from "Caesar Augustus" (30 B.C.–A.D. 14) orders a census of the whole world (Gr. *oikouménē*). It was the first (world census). Here Luke already exposes himself to criticism. There were world censuses under Augustus and under Claudius, but they were concerned with *Roman citizens* only. Vespasian seems to have been the first and only Roman emperor to order a population census (in A.D. 74). Luke's thinking has apparently been colored by knowledge of this census, which already lay some distance in the past at the time when he wrote.

The story continues with the remark that the census took place when Kurénios—Josephus calls him Kurínios—was governor of Syria. P. Sulpicius Quirinius was this Roman's full name, and he held the office of governor (more exactly "legate") of Syria twice, in 3–2 B.C. and in A.D. 6 (for how long is not known). Only his first appointment fell in the lifetime of King Herod (37 B.C.–A.D. 4), but during that time no census of Palestine—supposing now that Luke confused such a one with an empire census—could have been ordered by him; for Herod was an allied king (*rex socius*), responsible for governing his own kingdom. However, Quirinius, in his second tenure of office, did order a census. This was because Archelaus had been deposed, and the Romans were taking over the direct rule of Judaea. The purpose of such a census was purely financial: to record the taxpayers in the new territory and to see how much could be squeezed out of them. The census led to an uprising of the Zealots (Acts 5:37; cf. Jos., *Ant., 17,* 13, 5). If Luke were right in connecting the birth of Jesus with the census of Quirinius, Jesus would have been born in A.D. 6, several years after the death of Herod. While Herod is not mentioned in ch. 2, to fix the date of Jesus' birth after the death of Herod would make Jesus rather young for so prominent a role in A.D. 27–28 (cf. on 3:1).

For the purpose of a provincial census it was useless that every one should go to his (native) city to be recorded. In formulating v. 3 Luke has been influenced by what was customary in the case of a census of *Roman citizens,* who, if they did not go in person, at least had to send their declarations to their home towns.

People were recorded where they lived and where their taxes were collectible. A woman, furthermore, did not have to appear before the collectors; Mary's traveling to Bethlehem for that particular purpose was superfluous. It is quite evident, therefore, that Luke or his source was simply trying to find some plausible reason to bring Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem in order that Jesus might be born there. He had to be born there because the Messiah was to come from there (Mic. 5:2), and Jesus was the Messiah. Matthew chose another way out of the difficulty; he made Joseph and Mary residents of Bethlehem, who after the return from Egypt migrated to Nazareth (1:11; 2:22 f.).

According to Luke, then, Joseph "went up" from Galilee to (the higher altitude of) the "city of David" (ordinarily said only of Jerusalem in the Old Testament) called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and clan (the broader concept) of David, to be recorded with Mary his betrothed, she being pregnant. The original text, however, must have read "with Mary *his wife,*" for that reading, found in the Old Latin and Old Syriac, could never have arisen had the present one been original, whereas a change to the present one in view of the story of 1:27 is quite understandable. While they were there at Bethlehem, the (appointed number of) days for her giving birth became full (cf. 1:57) and she bore her firstborn son (which implies that she later had other sons) and she swathed him in bands (Ezek. 16:4, for the purpose of keeping the limbs straight) and laid him in a crib (Is. 1:3), or feeding place of animals, because there was not for them a(nother) place (to put the child) in the house or room (Gr. *katáluma;* cf. 22:11; Ex. 4:24, LXX; the term is vague) in which they had found lodging. The situation presupposed is that of the ordinary Palestinian peasants' home in which the family lives on a terrace two or three feet high, while the farm animals are in the adjoining ground-level space, which has niches in the terrace wall or side walls as cribs. Tradition later made a "cave" out of the "lodging," and one was soon found; over it a church was reared by Constantine—still standing in greatly rebuilt form and thus one of Christendom's oldest churches. But the story gives no warrant for thinking of a cave. No mention is made of the owner of the house, yet the subsequent story requires it: it was a house belonging to one or several (cf. Mk. 1:29) of the shepherds, presumably lent (in expectation of a present equivalent to what we would call a payment) to the couple expecting a birth. (Hospitable female attendance at the occasion would be assumed, if one were to think of it in realistic terms; but the sacred story can forgo mention of such minor matters.) In an earlier form of the story, the trip to Bethlehem may have been due to a desire of Joseph or Mary to have the child born there to make it qualify for Messiahship. By means of vv. 1–2 Luke has given the incident a marvelous setting. Even the mighty Augustus had to help make prophecy come true.

The story of the shepherds is really the central element of the narrative. They are camping out (it is evidently springtime—for the sheep go out in March/April and return in November) and experience the sudden appearance of an angel, while guarding their flock at night (cf. 1 Sam. 17:34 ff.). Along with the angel there is "the glory of the Lord"—here imagined as brilliant light that flooded upon the shepherds (cf. angel and attending light, Acts 12:7). The angel reassures them (cf. 1:13, 30). He is bringing them the good news of a great joy which will be to all the (Jewish) people—the news, namely, that there has been born to them that day in the city of David (= Bethlehem) a Savior (Gr. *sōtḗr*), who is "Christ, Lord" (the reading is hardly original, but as in Lam. 4:20, LXX, an error for "the Lord's Christ"; cf. 2:26). Voluntarily the angel gives them a confirmatory sign: they will find the babe (while that may imply a search, it does not need to do so) swathed and lying in a crib (which would not be the case where people are at home and have their own possessions). Suddenly the angel was joined (on terra firma?) by the "crowd of the heavenly host (1 Kings 22:19, LXX) praising God and saying: (there is) glory in the highest places (i.e., the heavens) to God, and on earth (there is) peace (= welfare) among men of (his) good pleasure" (i.e., those with whom God is pleased). This is a translation of a Hebrew phrase of which examples are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, e.g., the "sons of his good pleasure," "the chosen of good pleasure"—the latter instance without a possessive pronoun as here in Luke. The angels' words limit "all the people" of v. 10 to a certain category.

When the angels had departed to heaven,

the shepherds suggested to each other going through (the intervening area) to Bethlehem to see this word (= thing) which the Lord had made known to them. They went in haste and soon located a child answering the description. After seeing it they spread the report concerning the word spoken to them about this child by the angel. The report naturally evoked wonder. Mary (who of course had heard it directly from the shepherds) retained all these things, thinking about them in her heart (= mind). The implication is that only much later did she realize their importance, and this in turn presupposes that the original narrator did not know 1:26–38. The shepherds returned to their flocks, praising God for all they had heard and (now) had seen (for it was) exactly as it was told them (by the angel).

2:21–40 Circumcision and Presentation of Jesus. At the end of eight days the babe was circumcised and called Jesus, according to the angel's command in 1:31. Luke could reasonably suppose this. He therewith makes a transition to the next story.

When the (forty) days of Mary's purification were over—a woman was "unclean" after parturition for seven days, but had to stay at home another thirty-three days (Lev. 12:2–4)—"they" (the parents) brought the child to Jerusalem to present it (2 Cor. 11:2) to the Lord. In accordance with Ex. 13:2, the first born were consecrated to the deity (originally this implied human sacrifice), and had to be redeemed by payment of five shekels (Num. 18:15–16). The account of this payment has been omitted (it may have been waived in the case of poor people), but the obligatory sacrifice is mentioned. For those who could afford it, the law prescribed the sacrifice of a lamb; while for those who could not afford that, a pair of turtle doves (fully grown) or a pair of young pigeons (not yet fully grown) were prescribed (Lev. 12:6, 8). This was known as the offering of the poor (Heb. *qorban 'anī*). As women were not admitted to the inner court of the Temple, Mary must have presented her offering at the Nicanor gate (the Beautiful of Acts 3:2).

The occasion in the Temple receives an aura of Messianic significance through the bringing in of two prophetic personages—a man and a woman. The man, Simeon, is described as one of those righteous and pious men who were waiting for the "comforting" of Israel (a term for the coming redemption, derived from Is. 40:1) and as one on whom the Holy Spirit rested. He had received assurance from the Holy Spirit that he would not die until he had seen "the Anointed of the Lord" (the Messiah). This man came into the Temple through (impulse of) the Spirit (Mt. 12:18). And when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do (the sacrificing) for him according to the requirement, Simeon received Jesus into his arms and blessed (praised) God and spoke his *"Nunc dimittis."* Having been favored with fulfillment of the Spirit's promise, he is ready to accept, whenever God decrees, the slave's dismissal in peace (= a satisfied state of mind, Gen. 15:15; cf. 46:30). His eyes have seen (in the person of this child) the coming salvation (Is. 40:5), which God has prepared before the face of (i.e., in the sight of) all the peoples (contrast sing. in 2:10). These peoples, in the view of the poet, are subdivided into Gentiles and God's people Israel. The salvation will be a light for the enlightenment of the former (Is. 49:6 and Ps. 98:2), and a glorification (Phil. 2:11) for the latter.

The child's father and mother are astonished by this oracular revelation. The story is parallel in this respect to the revelation brought to them by the shepherds, 2:10–11, and likewise does not presuppose 1:26–38.

Simeon then blesses the parents and adds a special prophetic revelation for the mother, Mary. Here Christian reflection is mirrored, the destiny of the child taking on a more somber aspect in view of what actually was the course of Jesus' life. "This one is set for a fall and a rising of many in Israel (symbolism of a rock over which one may fall, Is. 8:14, or with the help of which one who has fallen may raise himself up), and for a "sign" that is (accepted by some as an indication of the coming redemption and) contradicted (11:30) (by others). [As for Mary herself the sword will go through the soul (= life as such, killing her).] (All this will come to pass) in order that the thoughts (Mk. 7:21), which are concealed in the hearts (Lk. 9:47) of many, may be revealed, i.e., the attitude of men toward this Jesus must become known (cf. Mt. 10:26). The bracketed words interrupt the connection and may have been added by Luke. They probably hint at the future grief of Mary over the crucifixion of her son, and thus give the oracle a personal touch.

Simeon was not called a prophet, yet he fulfills the function of one. A prophetess, however, is referred to in the person of one Hannah, of the north Israelite tribe of Asher (an item that would be of interest to a Galilean or Syrian storyteller). "She was advanced in many days" (the "many" is superfluous; cf. 1:7, 18). Indeed, she must have been over one hundred years old, since she married as a young virgin (see p. 120), lived seven years with her husband, and had been a widow eighty-four years. (The model wife does not marry a second time; cf. 1 Tim. 5:9; Judith 16:22; for a Roman example, Jos., *Ant., 18,* 6, 6.) Hannah did not depart from the Temple (*hyperbole*); this is the more remarkable, since, being a woman, she could never even enter the Court of the Israelites, in which "the house" and the great altar stood. She served (God) with fastings and prayers night and day. Standing there (at the time when the holy family was present), she praised God and spoke concerning him (i.e., Jesus) to all those awaiting Jerusalem's redemption (archaizing language).

Thus the infant Jesus was acclaimed in the Temple by two prophetic witnesses. The parents, having fulfilled the Mosaic regulations, now returned with their babe to their city of Nazareth. (Obviously the storyteller knew nothing of Mt. 2:1–22, with which this whole episode cannot be reconciled.) The development of Jesus is noted, as in the case of John (1:80). The child grew and became strong (being at the same time) filled with wisdom (intelligence?), and God's grace was upon him (furthering his development in every way).

2:41–52 An Episode of Jesus' Boyhood. It was obligatory for the father (not for the mother) of a boy to accustom him gradually to obeying the religious rules, for on completion of his thirteenth year he would be considered an adult. It was evidently in the line of such training that the boy Jesus at the age of twelve was taken along for the first time on the Passover pilgrimage. The laws of Ex. 23:17, 34:23 f., Deut. 16:16 f. thus gained practical meaning for him. Josephus states that those who wished to get quickly to Jerusalem from Galilee had to travel through Samaria, for in this way it was possible to reach Jerusalem in three days (*Vita,* 52). Travelers must have banded together for protection against robbers. Luke does not dwell on journey or sojourn except to refer to the "completing of the days," i.e., the seven days of Passover and Mazzoth (though it was not obligatory and perhaps not even customary for those from afar to spend all seven days there). The parents departed, thinking the boy had gone ahead with relatives and acquaintances, but on failing to find him at the first night's encampment, they returned the next day to Jerusalem. After looking high and low, they were startled to find him in the Temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers, listening to them and asking questions.

The narrative has vividly preserved a school scene. (There must have been other pupils besides Jesus, but this has been left out.) Talmudic sources give some reason to believe that there was a synagogue in or close by the Temple. With synagogues were associated schoolrooms for instructing the "little" in the Bible, and adult students in the systematic study of the Law. At twelve Jesus still belonged to the "little." The pupils sat on the ground before a teacher, who probably also sat on the ground. (Talmudic rules hold that if a teacher sits on a rug or cushion, the pupils should have the same advantage.) That the boy Jesus had a brilliant mind and showed it in both questions and answers is reflected by the story. Those present are described as having been amazed (cf. Mk. 2:12). Luke does not dwell on such mundane matters as where the boy had spent the night or obtained food. The whole interest is focused on the single saying of the boy in response to the rebuke of his mother "Child: why didst thou do thus to us? Behold thy father and I, as deeply grieving ones, seek thee!" (i.e., they are and have been looking everywhere). He replied, "What (is it) that you sought me (everywhere)? Did you not know that it is necessary for me to be in the things of my Father (i.e., in the Temple)?" They, however, did not understand the words that he spoke to them. The story is thus basically parallel in function to several of its predecessors (cf. 2:19, 33), and like them ignores 1:26–38, in the light of which all marveling should have been unnecessary. It may have come from a Jewish-Christian source, which stressed the natural ability of the lad and his consciousness of divine Sonship rather than revelation from on high. The love of the Temple here attributed to him finds some reflection in the story of his cleansing of it (19:41–48). In his message and ministry, however, the Temple seems merely to have had a traditional place; his interest was in the coming kingdom of God.

PART I THE GALILEAN PERIOD

3:1–9:50 (Mk. 1–9; Mt. 3–18)

3:1–6 John the Baptist (Mk. 1:1–6; Mt. 3:1–6). Luke can now follow the order of events in Mark. But in this piece he both supplements and abridges. He first prefixes an important chronological item (cf. 2:1 f.) based on his own research: John the Baptist began his ministry in the fifteenth year of the Emperor Tiberius (A.D. 14–37). Unhappily the regnal years were reckoned differently in Rome than in Syria, and one cannot be certain which calendar Luke had in mind (Eastern: Oct. 1, 27 to Oct. 1, 28; Western: Aug. 19, 28 to Aug. 19, 29). Luke also gives a series of synchronisms: Pontius Pilate was governor of Judaea, Herod (Antipas) was tetrarch of Galilee, Philip was tetrarch of Ituraea and the Trachonitis, Lysanias was tetrarch of Abilene (in southern Syria). He then adds "under the high priest (sing.) Annas *and* Caiaphas." This statement, if textually intact, reveals perplexity or lack of clarity on Luke's part, for there can be only one high priest. Annas (Josephus calls him Ananos) was really an ex-high priest, who had held office *c.* A.D. 6–15, and had been succeeded by a son, Eleasar, and then by his son-in-law, Joseph Caiaphas (*c.* 18–36). (After Caiaphas, sons of Annas followed again in the high priesthood.) But ex-high priests may have kept their title in popular usage, and the mention of Annas is understandable because he must have been the power behind the throne, so to speak (cf. Acts 4:6).

God's word came to John *the son of Zacharias* (Luke's addition?) in the wilderness. The statement thus links up with 1:80. Wherever John may have been, he now came into the region round the Jordan. The phraseology suggests a migratory ministry in the Jordan valley, in which there were a number of towns of consequence, thus differing from the view that people came to seek him out *in* the wilderness (Mk. 1:4; Mt. 3:1). Luke agrees, however, with Mk. 1:4 on the subject of his preaching and connects with it Is. 40:3, but puts the quotation last instead of first and cites two additional verses. He omits Mark's reference to the Judaeans coming to John, their confession of sins, and the account of John's personal habits. A downgrading of John is apparent here.

3:7–9 John's Preaching of Repentance (Mt. 3:7–10), Q. Luke adduces Q material here, but describes John as addressing the crowds that came to be baptized by him (Codex D: "before him"; cf. Mk. 3:6), rather than the Pharisees and Sadducees. The other divergences from Matthew are negligible.

3:10–14 John's Advice to Special Groups. Luke here injects a section of his special material. The crowds ask John what then they can do (to fulfill the will of God and escape his wrath)? He replies: Share with the poor! A group of publicans came to be baptized, and, politely calling him "teacher," ask the same question. Answer: Be honest. Soldiers (of Herod Antipas?) ask: What can *we* do? Answer: Do not intimidate (a person) or extort (money from him), but be content with your pay (a response that suggests that this mercenary soldiery was quite a burden on the inhabitants of the region). This material does not rise above the level of everyday morality. Perhaps Luke intends his readers to perceive the qualitative difference between the preaching of John and that of Jesus in the Sermon on the Plain.

3:15–18 John's Preaching concerning the Messiah (Mt. 3:11–12; cf. Mk. 1:7–8), Q. At the beginning, Luke formulates afresh to make a transition to the Q material. He describes the people as in expectation, asking themselves whether John might be the Messiah (cf. Jn. 1:19). What is found in Mt. 3:11 ff. is given here as a reply by John to the people's unspoken question. Luke agrees with Mark, however, in having John say that he is not worthy of untying the thongs of the sandals of the coming one (Mt.: to carry his sandals). He then adds a summary remark, not found in Mark or Matthew, about John's preaching many other things to the people, exhorting them. (The verb "preach" here hardly means "preached good news," as it does in Acts 8:25.)

3:19–20 John's Imprisonment. Stimulated by Mk. 1:14a, Luke at this point reports the imprisonment of John. It is not his purpose to include the story of Mk. 6:17–29 about the death of the Baptist. Therefore he gives now what he knows about it. He has John reprove Herod the tetrarch because of Herodias "his brother's wife" (omitting Mark's erroneous identification of that brother with Philip) and because of all the (other) evil things which Herod had done. (Luke knows more than he reveals, for he had information about Herod from sources close to his court; cf. on 8:1–3). He now added to all these evils the one of imprisoning John. The latter's beheading is mentioned in passing in 9:9.

3:21–22 The Baptism of Jesus (Mk. 1:9–11; Mt. 3:13–17). The story of the Baptism is brought in rather belatedly as though to divorce it entirely from the activity of John. The Baptist's followers may have made too much out of the Christian admission that Jesus was baptized by their leader. The event furthermore is told in a peculiar, subordinated manner. "It happened that when all the people were baptized and Jesus too had been baptized *and was praying,* that the heaven was opened, etc." The principal clause which holds the emphasis is thus the opening (Mk.: "rending") of the heaven (sing.; Mk. pl.). By introducing the idea of Jesus' praying, the suggestion is given that this happened in response to his prayer. Clearly Luke is downgrading the Baptism of Jesus as such. He not only omits John's role in connection with it, but also that the opening of the heavens occurred at the moment when Jesus came up out of the water. Whereas in Mark "the spirit as a dove descended *unto* him," Luke has the *Holy* Spirit descend *upon* him (the preposition chosen with an eye to 4:18) *in bodily form,* as a dove. Luke thus seeks to rule out any thought of a mere vision. The voice from heaven is given as in Mark; however, this conformity could have been established by editors, for according to Codex D and early Fathers, the voice spoke Ps. 2:7.

3:23–38 The Genealogy of Jesus (cf. Mt. 1:1–17). "Jesus was, *when he began,* about thirty years old." If the italicized words, which are missing in the Sinaitic Syriac, are original, Luke thinks of the career of Jesus as beginning at this point. The mention of the age of Jesus is qualified; obviously Luke was not sure of himself on this. If one connects the statement with 3:1 then Jesus would have been born a year or two before the beginning of the Christian era as now reckoned. If Jesus had been born when Quirinius held the census, he would have been only twenty-two to twenty-three. If he were born a year or two before Herod the Great died (4 B.C.), then he would have been about thirty-five. On the statement of Jn. 8:57, which would imply an age of forty plus, cf. the comments on that passage. Perhaps the Qumran community's regulations help explain the age attributed to Jesus by Luke: there a man was permitted to go to law, render judgment and hold a military or political office at thirty (cf. Num. 4:3).

Transition is now made to a genealogy. Jesus was the son—*as was thought*—of Joseph, (son) of Eli, etc. It is obvious that the italicized words were added to establish a harmonization with the narrative of the virgin birth. The original genealogist did not know or could not accept that story, for no one would go to the trouble of setting up a completely futile pedigree. It makes sense only if Jesus were regarded by the author of the genealogy as the son of Joseph. Its inclusion at this belated juncture raises (unanswerable) questions about the literary process whereby this Gospel reached its present form.

Matthew's genealogy is put the other way round and begins with Abraham, father of the chosen people. Luke backtracks from Joseph to God, for his last words, "(son) of Adam, (son) of God," imply that Adam, the ultimate human father of Jesus, was the son of God. This closing thought may be Luke's contribution. He evidently saw in the divine sonship of Adam a prophetic anticipation of the divine sonship of the second Adam, Jesus. (Influence of Paul's teaching? Cf. Rom. 5:14, 1 Cor. 15:22, 45–49.) While the genealogist has not given a grouping of names like Matthew's, the material readily divides in analogous manner; from Jesus to Salathiel, 3 x 7 names; from Salathiel to David, 3 x 7 (contrary to Mt., Salathiel is not of the direct royal line, but a descendant of Nathan, 2 Sam. 5:14; Zech., 12: 12); from David to Abraham, 2 x 7 (Mt. 1:2–6); and from Abraham to Adam again 3 x 7. We may note that the list does not have as good a transcription of Hebrew names as does Matthew's.

4:1–13 The Temptation (Mt. 4:1–11; cf. Mk. 1:12–13), Q. Luke has slightly changed his source (Q) at the beginning. Full of *Holy Spirit* (3:22) Jesus turns back from the Jordan (John's bailiwick) and is led about in the wilderness by the (indwelling) Spirit for forty days, being tempted by the Devil. The wording suggests the recurrence of temptations during the forty days, as in Mark, but this is not followed out. Jesus eats nothing in those days (this is stronger than Matthew's fasting), and when they are completed he is hungry; it is then that the Devil (Mark used Aramaic *Satanas*) addresses him. In the first temptation he bids him "speak to this stone that it may become bread." In his reply Jesus quotes less from Deut. 8:3 than in Matthew. The order of the second and third temptations is different in Luke. We may assume that in that respect he is following Q, for which document the Temple scene was evidently climactic—as is quite understandable if Q arose in the Jerusalem Church in the early days. In the second temptation there is considerable variation from Matthew. The Devil leads Jesus up (the high mountain is not referred to, and an aerial point of vantage may be meant); he shows him all the kingdoms of the inhabited earth (Gr. *oikouménē*) "in a moment." He declares, "To thee I will give all this power *and their glory*" (the latter phrase, unsuitable here, is a reminder of Mt. 4:8, and may be understood as a marginal remark of a reader). He explains that it (the power) is handed over to him (by God) and that he can give it to whom he wills. Therefore, if Jesus will prostrate himself before the Devil, it shall all be his. The third temptation agrees closely with Matthew's second except for minor differences; Luke uses the city name in the form *Hierousalêm* (Mt.: the Holy City) and has the Devil quote from Ps. 91:11–12 in two excerpts (Mt. runs together). The dismissal of the Devil and the ministering of the angels are not mentioned. Writing freely here Luke says that having exhausted all temptation, the Devil desisted "for a time." He thus imagines that Jesus was free from temptation in the period of his ministry, until the Devil again took a hand in 22:3. The temptation is less real in Luke than in Matthew because Jesus is full of the Holy Spirit when it takes place; in Matthew, the Spirit merely leads Jesus into the wilderness (and leaves him there), to endure an ordeal in which he proves himself forever immune to the wiles of the tempter.

4:14–15 Appearance of Jesus in Galilee (Mk. 1:14–15; Mt. 4:12–17). Luke parallels Mark in relating Jesus' coming to Galilee, but omits mentioning John's imprisonment. (Jesus' activity is not to be viewed as prompted by that event, which, therefore, was related in 3:20.) He emphasizes Jesus' going in the power of the Spirit and describes the report about him as going down through the whole environment." Luke then tells of Jesus' teaching in the synagogues, and records that he was praised by all. (Mark leaves the synagogue activity until 1:39 and lacks the praise.) The surprising thing, however, is that Luke does not quote the succinct statement of Mk. 1:15 about the initial message of Jesus. This is in line with his policy of toning down the eschatological nature of Jesus' preaching.

4:16–30 Jesus in the Synagogue at Nazareth (Mk. 6:1–6; Mt. 13:53–58)

vv. 16–22 Luke has chosen to put an appearance at Nazareth here and to omit it at the point where it follows in Mark (8:56 = Mk. 5:43). Jesus went to the synagogue on the Sabbath, as was his wont. Apparently the lessons from the Prophets were not yet prescribed at the time of Jesus, as they were later, though when Jesus arose to read he was given the scroll of Isaiah (by the attendant). The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll, a leather roll twenty-two and one-half inches high, that was unrolled from left to right (to uncover wide columns with twenty-nine lines of writing, with paragraphing for easier reading), has provided a marvelous illustration of the kind of scroll that was used in the time of Jesus.

In opening the scroll Jesus happened on Is. 61. One might infer that continuous reading from this scroll had been going on for some time so that the columns near the end of the book were most readily available. Luke quotes this passage in the LXX translation with an added element from Is. 58:6. Having finished reading, Jesus rolled up the book, handed it to the attendant, and seated himself to address the assembly. (The teacher sat during his discourse.) All eyes were now upon him. He began with the words, "Today this Scripture (= passage) that is in your ears (i.e., that you have just heard) has been fulfilled." He thus is portrayed as emphasizing the significance of his own coming. He is the one on whom God's Spirit rests; God has anointed him to preach to the poor and unfortunate (cf. 7:22; Mt. 5: 3–4). The acceptable year (the year in which God accepts, or year of grace) has now begun. The public reaction to the message is then described: "All bore witness to him" (i.e., expressed themselves favorably) and marveled at the words full of graciousness (cf. Ps. 45:2) that came from his mouth, and said, "Is that not the son of Joseph?" (apparently in an approving sense, not derogatory as in Mk. 6:3). The question could imply that Jesus had been gone from Nazareth for a very long time, and was hardly recognized at first.

vv. 23–24 The narrator imagines the words of the people as overheard by Jesus before his discourse was ended. In his response he said prophetically, "You will doubtless say to me (in the future), 'Physician heal thyself' (i.e., do something for your own benefit; cf. 23:39). What things we (shall have) heard of as happening at Capernaum do also here in thy paternal city." He thus anticipates a later appearance at Nazareth after a successful ministry at Capernaum, which has not begun yet. It is, of course, the visit related in Mk. 6:1–6. Luke has omitted that, but utilizes a part of it here predictively, notably the saying: "No prophet is acceptable in his paternal city" (this varies from Mk. 6:4 = Mt. 13:57; cf. Jn. 4:44). Luke's form of the saying appears also in a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, but with the added words "neither does a physician do healings to those knowing him," which some scholars believe should be restored here. The proverb of the physician is also found in rabbinic literature and has Greek and Roman parallels.

vv. 25–27 Luke has put here several sayings which seemed to him to serve the purpose of warning that the proffered salvation, if rejected, could just as well pass to the Gentiles. This gave the incident a greater significance for Gentile readers. Two examples of God's favoring Gentiles over Israelites are offered: Elijah was sent to Sarepta or Zarephath of the Sidonian country to a (heathen) widow (1 Kings 17:9) at the time of the famine, which here is said to have lasted three *and one-half* years. That figure agrees with Jas. 5:17 against 1 Kings 18:1. In both cases the reference is probably to an Apocryphon giving a popular rehash of the events and influenced by reflection on Dan. 7:25. Elisha was told to cure Naaman, the Syrian (2 Kings 5).

vv. 28–30 These sayings, and the warning they implied according to Luke, turned public favor into anger. The people arose and drove Jesus out of the city, leading him to "the rim of the mountain on which their city was built" to cast him down. But he, going through the midst of them (miraculously? cf. Jn. 7:30, 44; 8:59) proceeded on his way. Neither Mark nor Matthew confirm such an end to Jesus' visit to Nazareth, nor does the situation of Nazareth suit this description. The "Mount of the Leap," where tradition localizes the event, is too far away—a mile and a half south of Nazareth. If Jesus could "go through their midst," there was no need of his waiting to do so until he had been led to that distant precipice. Since Luke's geographical information is extremely vague, one may suspect that he has just imagined the situation of Nazareth, perhaps on the basis of the saying about the city set on a mountain (Mt. 5:14). The thought of casting Jesus down may have been suggested by such a custom as that existing at Athens of executing men either by stoning or by throwing them into the abyss called *Barathron* (cf. Heliodorus, *Aethiopica, 1,* 12). The Athenians in violation of international usage had done the latter thing to the ambassadors of Darius, thus provoking the gods (Herod., *7,* 133). Jesus was God's ambassador (v. 18), and to cast him down from the height was a similar crime. That the Nazarenes did not succeed in killing him did not relieve them of their guilt.

Why did Luke put the visit to Nazareth here, and build it up in this manner? It is not out of a desire to be historically more accurate, for the peculiar predictive allusion to Capernaum betrays that the ministry in Capernaum actually preceded the appearance at Nazareth. There may be many reasons, but the main one must be that he sees a fitness in Jesus' presenting his program at the beginning of his activities and at Nazareth. (This place may have been anti-Christian in Luke's time.) He had omitted Mark's report about what Jesus preached when he came to Galilee (Mk. 1:15). Here he unfolds the message with a different slant than Mark's. The year of Jesus' ministry was the year of grace for mankind—the greatest year in all history. He came to bring the fulfillment of the prophecies of Is. 61:1–2. Miracles would be done—but at Capernaum. The hope of the Nazarenes to see similar ones was vain, since a prophet is without honor in his own country. God elects whom he wills—in the days of the Prophets he chose to help Gentiles (and he can do so again).

The action of the Nazarenes is symbolic and prophetic of Jesus' rejection by Israel. His escape is like the vanishing of the risen Christ—an advance intimation of his divine nature. It shows that he could have escaped crucifixion, too, had he chosen, but he came to fulfill the prophecies, and so died according to what was foreordained.

4:31–37 Jesus in the Synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 1:21–28; cf. Mt. 7:28–29). Luke now tells of Jesus' going down to Capernaum, which he describes as a city in Galilee. No intimation of its location on the shore of the lake of Galilee is given. He omits Mark's account of the calling of the two pairs of brothers, which preceded the entry into Capernaum, since he intends to substitute 5:1–11 for that. He merely states that Jesus went to the city and taught there on the Sabbath. The impression made is related as in Mark, but the allusion to his teaching being different from that of the scribes is omitted.

The healing in the synagogue proceeds as in Mark, with minor variations. If the sufferer is described as "a man who had the spirit of an unclean demon," this can hardly be the original text; two variants, "a man with an unclean spirit" and "a man who had a demon," have apparently been combined. The exorcism scene is slightly changed: the demon throws the man down into the midst (of the assembly) and goes forth (silently, in obedience to the command) without harming him in any way. Luke also varies Mark's language in describing the reaction of the people. They ask: "What is this word (= teaching)? With authority and (consequent) power he commands the unclean spirits."

4:38–39 The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law (Mk. 1:29–31; Mt. 8:14–15). On rising up (i.e., departing) from the synagogue, Jesus goes to the house of Simon. No explanation is given of how he met Simon. The companions of Mk. 1:29 are lost sight of. Instead of certain persons speaking to Jesus concerning the sick mother-in-law, "they ask him concerning her" (to exert his power on her behalf). The description of Jesus' manner of curing the woman is distinctively given: "Standing over her he rebuked the fever (-demon) and it departed" (cf. v. 35).

4:40–41 Healings at Eventide (Mk. 1: 32–34; Mt. 8:16–17). The subsequent evening healings are reported as in Mark but with clarification of the procedure: Jesus laid hands on each one whom he healed. The demons, on being driven out and before they were bid to depart, cried out: "Thou art the Son of God"; Mark's "they knew him" is explained "they knew that he was the Christ."

4:42–43 Departure from Capernaum (Mk. 1:35–38). Mark's account is robbed of some of its characteristic elements. "When it became day," Jesus went forth to a lonely place. His praying is omitted as well as the pursuit by "Simon and those with him" and their report that all were seeking him. Instead, the *crowds* seek him and try to restrain him from leaving them. Jesus says it is *necessary* for him to go to other cities to preach (cf. 2:18) the kingdom of God (in a noneschatological sense, cf. 10:9) because for that he has been *sent.*

4:44 Itinerant Preaching in Galilee (Mk. 1:39; Mt. 4:23–25). Luke here has shortened Mark's text. He cuts out the "all" before the geographical name and the exorcising activity. While the received text has "Galilee," the best Greek manuscripts and the Sinaitic Syriac read "Judaea"; if original this would be merely an instance of the broad use of the latter term.

5:1–11 The Great Catch of Fish (cf. Mk. 1:16–20; Mt. 4:18–22; Jn. 21:4–8). The crowd is pressing against Jesus, eager to hear the word of God. Jesus is standing at the lake of Gennesaret. Seeing two boats beached there while the fishermen are washing their nets, he goes aboard the one belonging to Simon (4:38) and asks him to put out a little from the shore. Seated in it (4:20), he teaches "the crowds." When he finishes speaking, he bids them (Simon and his companions) row out into the deep water and lower their (drag-)nets for a catch. Simon, addressing Jesus as "master" (Gr. *epistátēs,* equivalent to Rabbi, used only in Lk. and there only by the disciples), says they have fished all night and caught nothing, but that at his word (proved so potent in 4:35, 39) he will do so. (The storyteller fails to harmonize his materials by not mentioning that Jesus went ashore again.) Carrying out the instruction, they catch so many fish that the netting begins to tear. They motion to their comrades in the other boat (cf. Mk. 1:20) to come and help them, and they fill both boats with fish so that they ride dangerously low. (When they have brought the boats into shallow water) Simon *Peter* (comes ashore and) falls down before Jesus in awe, asking him to depart from him because he is a sinful man (and such a one is in peril in the presence of Holiness, cf. 1 Kings 17:17–18). He calls Jesus "Lord" (*Kyrios*). Strangely, Luke completely omits reference to Simon's brother, Andrew. (Were the heretics already making much of him in Luke's time? Cf. the later apocryphal books of Apostolic Acts.) He speaks of James and John as associates (which could mean business partners) of Simon. Jesus replies that Simon should not be afraid; henceforth he will catch men. (In Codex D, not only Peter but his companions are addressed: "Come and be not fishers of fish, for I will make you fishers of men.") They pull their boats up on the shore, leave all things and follow him; that James and John also joined is implied. Who took care of the fish and equipment is a matter too unimportant even to think of (cf. Mk. 1:20).

It seems very probable that the post-resurrection incident reported in a late version in Jn. 21:4–8 has here been fused with Mk. 1:16–20 and Mk. 4:1, thus projecting it back into the life of the historical Jesus. Peter's confession of sinfulness excellently fits the situation, after his denial, and his approaching the risen Lord in Jn. 21:7 is analogous to Lk. 5:8. This does not mean that we here can get back to a knowledge of Peter's resurrection experience, of which 1 Cor. 15:5 speaks; for Peter must have been alone when he saw the risen Lord. But we can discern here the existence of an Easter story more primitive than that of Jn. 21. By using elements of it, Luke has made the account of the calling of the first disciples more impressive than Mark had done.

5:12–16 The Healing of a Leper (Mk. 1:40–45; Mt. 8:1–4). This originally continues the thread of 4:44 (cf. Mk. 1:39) and thus should have stood before 5:1–11. The incident takes place in one of the cities Jesus visited. The man is "full of leprosy"; he "falls on his face" (Mk.: he kneels) in beseeching Jesus and addresses him as "Lord." The pity and the anger of Jesus are left out, as well as the healed man's violating the directive to keep quiet; the news spreads by itself. The praying of Jesus, which was left out in 4:42 (cf. Mk. 1:35), is introduced here in a generalizing way: "He was withdrawing in the desert places and praying" (cf. 6:12). It is Luke who has thus created the impression of Jesus' being given to habitual prayer. Mark's idea that crowds came to him in the desert places is set aside.

5:17–26 The Healing of a Paralytic (Mk. 2:1–12; Mt. 9:1–8). Luke leaves out Jesus' going into Capernaum and the report of his being "at the house," but the narrative presupposes that he was in a city (cf. v. 12). He was teaching (in Mk.: "preaching" the Word). Luke mentions at the outset that Pharisees and "teachers of the Law" (usually: "scribes") were sitting by—an item Mark defers until later. The text of the rest of the sentence, however, cannot be intact, as there could hardly have been an assembly of Pharisees and teachers of the Law from every village of Galilee and from Judaea and Jerusalem! The Old Syriac, instead of "who had come," reads: "and they (the people) who had come from every village of Galilee." The words "and of Judaea and Jerusalem" must be regarded as glossatory, intended to apply to the teachers of the Law (cf. Mk. 3:22). Luke then adds the remarkable statement that "the power of the Lord (God) was with him to heal." The arrival of the bearers of the paralytic is given with a little more detail than in Mark. For the "pallet" a "bed" is substituted. The event develops as in Mark, but the removal of the roof is left out; they lower the sufferer "through the tiles." Luke may here be thinking of the more substantial roofs in Greek cities. Jesus addresses the paralytic as "man" rather than as "child." The narrative then follows Mark's with only minor variations. Slight detail is added about how the paralytic arose before all and taking up "that upon which he had lain" went to his house, praising God. Codex D, perhaps rightly, omits the first two statements of v. 26; they overload the verse, and Luke has already mentioned the praise of God in v. 25. The closing statement: "They were filled with fear and said: 'We have seen incredible things (Gr. *parádoxa*) today' " is stronger than Mark's, "We never saw anything like this."

5:27–32 The Call of Levi and Association with Publicans (Mk. 2:13–17; Mt. 9:9–13). Luke omits mention of the lakeside scene and of the teaching of the crowds (Mk. 2:13). Jesus simply goes forth "after these things," sees a publican named Levi ("son of Alpheus" omitted), and calls him. Luke adds that Levi "left all things" and followed Jesus (5:11). This remark, however, does not fit very well with Levi's making a great banquet in his house, unless one restricts the "all things" to those connected with his momentary activity: pen and ink, ledger, collected moneys. The phraseology is simply the characteristic one for discipleship, cf. 9:57 f. At the banquet a large crowd of publicans "and others" (instead of Mark's "sinners," which word, however, is used in v. 30), recline with them (i.e., with Jesus and his disciples). The Pharisees murmur, not against Jesus, but against the *disciples.* In the comment of Jesus, Mark's "those who are strong" is changed to "those who are well," and the "calling" of sinners is made a call *to repentance.*

5:33–39 The Question about Fasting (Mk. 2:18–22; Mt. 9:14–17)

vv. 33–35 Luke (contrary to Mark) joins this with the preceding incident. Grammatically, the Pharisees are the ones who propound the question; in Mark it is the people who do so (in Mt.: the disciples of John). Luke makes the questioners state that the disciples of John fast *often* (cf.

Acts 24:26) and "make" prayers (3 Macc. 2:1). The words "likewise those of the Pharisees" may be an editorial addition (they were omitted in Marcion's text of Lk.; cf. also on Mk. 2:18). The allusion to the prayers of the disciples of John fits with 11:1, but, in the reply of Jesus, only fasting is considered.

vv. 36–39 Luke gives this material independent status, introducing it as a "parable." Jesus here speaks of tearing a piece from a new garment and putting it on an old garment (Mk.: sewing a piece of unbleached cloth on an old garment); if one does this he will tear the new, and the patch from the new will not harmonize with the old. The latter remark seems added for the purpose of making the saying more reasonable, after the puzzling allusion to "tearing the new." In the saying about the wineskins, Luke, like Matthew, adds reference to the proper procedure in v. 38. But a further saying is appended in the final verse (39). "No one (who is used to) drinking old wine desires new (wine)," for he says: "The old is milder." This trivial observation is missing in Codex D and other ancient authorities; perhaps it was a marginal remark by some later reader.

6:1–5 Plucking Grain on the Sabbath (Mk. 2:23–28; Mt. 12:1–8). This closely follows Mark. In speaking of how the disciples ate some ears of grain Luke adds "rubbing them in their hands." As in Matthew, the reference to Abiathar is omitted as well as the pithy saying about the Sabbath being made for man, which in Mark is the premise for the final statement: Lord of the Sabbath is the "Son of man." Luke, like Matthew, takes this phrase as the Messianic title. Codex D replaces 6:5 with a brief incident containing a further saying of Jesus. "The same day, beholding one working on the Sabbath, he said to him 'Man if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law.' " This is clearly a supplement, drawn from some apocryphal Gospel.

6:6–11 The Healing of the Withered Hand (Mk. 3:1–6; Mt. 12:9–14). Luke mentions the Sabbath and Jesus' teaching in the synagogue. He identifies those who watched Jesus as the Pharisees, and states that Jesus knew their thoughts even before he asked the question about the legality of healing on this day. Luke omits the silence of the adversaries and the anger and grief of Jesus as he looked at them. Luke also leaves out the plotting of the Pharisees with the Herodians to destroy Jesus, replacing it with a remark about their senseless rage and their discussing what they could do to Jesus.

6:12–16 The Election of the Twelve (Mk. 3:13–19; Mt. 10:1–4). Luke, like Matthew, puts this before the Sermon of Jesus, but with 6:17–19 intervening. Uncertain of the order of events, he begins with the stereotyped phrase "it happened in those days." While in Mark, Jesus merely ascends "the mountain," Luke has him go forth (from where is not stated) to the mountain to pray, even continuing through the night praying to God (cf. 5:16). Luke has in mind the sort of thing done in the Church when missionaries were appointed (cf. Acts 13:3). He thereby renders more solemn the important occasion that follows. At daybreak Jesus called his "disciples" (where they were is not said) and chose twelve from them. "Disciples" thus for Luke is a broader term. He leaves out the purpose of Jesus in this act (Mk. 3:14), but picking out the essential point—"to send them forth"—he makes Jesus coin the designation "Apostles" for the Twelve. The list of the Twelve differs from that of Mark, not only in a few shifts of order, but in introducing a Judas, son of James, and in omitting Thaddeus; Simon Cananaeus here is "Simon the one called Zelotes" (see p. 53), and Judas Iscariot, "who (later) became a traitor."

6:17–19 Jesus Heals the Crowds (Mk. 3:7–12; Mt. 12:15–21; cf. Mt. 4:25 and 4:24). Mark did not have the election of the Twelve before this piece, but rather after it. Luke may have changed the order in the interest of providing a staging for the Sermon of 6:20 f. Luke omits the departure with the disciples to the sea (for which he has substituted that to the mountain in v. 12) and so the boat episode naturally drops out. What he offers is a descent of Jesus from the mountain to the plain, accompanied by a "big crowd of his disciples." He then continues with the "great multitude" of Mk. 3:7, adding "of the people," but cutting out some of the geographical names. He mentions only Judaea and Jerusalem (the latter omitted in Codex D) and the coastal region of Tyre and Sidon. Is his pen here guided by the situation prevailing at some point in the history of the Primitive Church? Had Christianity been wiped out in Galilee and Peraea—regions so important to Mark? A relative clause states that the people had come to hear him and to be healed of their diseases (this is missing in Mk.). Luke notes that those afflicted by unclean spirits were healed. (Mk. puts this later.) He takes over Mark's report that the whole crowd sought to touch Jesus, but adds that this was because power went forth from him (cf. 8:44–45). He healed all (in Mk.: many). The reaction of the unclean spirits and Jesus' command to them (Mk. 3:11–12) are left out.

The Sermon on the Plain
6:20–49 (Mt. 5–7), Q

Luke now forsakes Mark and introduces different material. Jesus lifts up his eyes to his disciples (all those of v. 17) and addresses them, in the hearing of the people (7:1). The substance of this speech corresponds to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. The critical theory holds that both Matthew and Luke drew upon the hypothetical source, Q, composed primarily of sayings of Jesus. But Luke's version of the Sermon is much shorter, and many of the sayings in the version of Matthew are found in different contexts in Luke. It is unlikely that Luke would have dismantled a sermon as extensive as Matthew's if he had found it in his source. The probability is therefore that Matthew took passages out of the source at other points and arranged them to fashion his more comprehensive discourse.

The following Table, based on Matthew, shows what corresponding material Luke uses in the Sermon on the Plain and what is found elsewhere in his book.

MATTHEW	LUKE
5:3–12 (Beatitudes)	6:20–23
5:13–14 (Salt)	14:34–35
5:15–16 (Light)	11:33
5:18 (Jot and tittle)	16:17
5:25–26 (On way to judge)	12:58–59
5:32 (Divorce)	16:18
5:38–48 (Eye for an eye)	6:27–36
6:9–13 (Lord's Prayer)	11:1–4
6:19–21 (Gathering treasure)	12:33–34
6:22–23 (Eye, light of body)	11:34–36
6:24 (Two masters)	16:13
6:25–34 (Anxiety)	12:22–31
7:1–6 (Judging)	6:37–38, 41–42
7:7–11 (Petitioning)	11:9–13
7:12 (Golden Rule)	6:31
7:16–21 (By their fruits)	6:43–46
7:22–23 (Prophecy)	13:26–27
7:24–27 (Parable of builders)	6:47–49

Comparison of the two versions suggests that Luke often has the sayings in the more original form; that is to say, in Matthew they have become more rounded out and modified in meaning.

6:20–23 The Beatitudes (Mt. 5:3, 5, 6, 11, 12). Jesus addresses his hearers in the second person: "Blessed are you poor." This is clearly more original than, "Blessed are the poor in spirit"; the latter version of the saying generalizes and adds a phrase to guard against misunderstanding. In Luke's version, Jesus is speaking to the literally poor, as is confirmed by the second Beatitude: "Blessed are ye that now hunger," which shows that Jesus was speaking to those who never had enough to eat; Matthew broadens and spiritualizes this to hungering and thirsting after righteousness. The third Beatitude "Blessed are you who now weep, for you will laugh" is clearly more original than "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted."

Not only has Matthew shifted the meaning; he has increased the number of the Beatitudes, though perhaps on the basis of other authentic sayings. The longer Beatitude of v. 22 does not, in Luke, fall outside the pattern as does Matthew's in Mt. 5:11, and it is more vivid. Those addressed are called blessed when hated and excluded (from the synagogue) *and reviled* (interpretative of the next phrase?)

and given a bad name on account of the Son of man. On that day they are to rejoice, for their reward is great in heaven. (Let them expect nothing else here), for thus did the fathers of their persecutors to the Prophets. Jesus thus proclaims the coming kingdom, in which the miserable lot of his followers will be changed. We may prefer Matthew's form of the saying, but the Lucan one is probably more original.

6:24–26 Four Woes. In Luke, the Beatitudes are followed by woes. But the persons to whom they were addressed were hardly in the audience, and Matthew is more "original" in not including them in this connection. Jesus says: "Woe to the rich, they have their comfort now (and can expect none in God's kingdom). Woe to them that are full (1:53) for they will hunger. Woe to them that laugh, they will mourn and weep. Woe (to them) when all men speak nicely of them—their fathers did the same things to the false prophets." (This combination seems artificial; the conclusion resembles that of v. 23.)

6:27–36 On Love of One's Enemies (Mt. 5:44, 39–42; 7:12; 5:46–47, 45, 48). His followers are not only to love their enemies and pray for those that abuse (Mt.: persecute) them, but to do good to those that hate them and bless those that curse them. The admonition not to resist the Evil One (Mt. 5:39) is omitted. One is not to hinder him, who takes both outer and inner garment (Mt.: give the outer to him who takes the inner). The verse about the second mile (Mt. 5:41) has no equivalent here. In place of the saying about not refusing one who wants to borrow (Mt. 5:42b) Luke has not to refuse the one who takes one's own. With this he joins the Golden Rule, but without the final remark of Mt. 7:12. Then, paralleling Mt. 5:46, Jesus asks: "What thanks (heavenly reward, Mt. 'pay') will they have for loving those that love them? Even the sinners do that" (Mt.: do not the publicans do the same?). Luke does not have the example of saluting only one's brethren (5:47), but instead gives two other instances in which the sinners do the same thing (so that there is no particular reward for it): doing good to those who do good to them, and lending to those from whom one hopes to receive. Rather, they are to love and do good to their enemies, and lend where there is no hope of getting back anything. Then their reward will be great and they will be sons of the Most High (cf. Lk. 1:23, 35, 76), because he too is kind to the ungrateful and evil. (The thought, though not the phraseology, is the same in Mt. 5:45.) This group of sayings ends with an admonition to be merciful as their Father is (for "your father" cf. 12:30, 32; in Lk. Jesus generally says "my Father" as in Jn.).

6:37–42 On Judging (Mt. 7:1–5; 15:14; 10:24–25; 7:3–5)

vv. 37–38 After starting like Mt. 7:1, Luke continues differently (the material Mt. 7:3–5 appears below in vv. 41–42). He introduces an admonition against condemning, and a command to forgive (i.e., release one's debtor from his obligation), and another to give. All of these have for their corollary that at the judgment one will be dealt with accordingly by God. The recompense for giving is especially elaborated. They (the angels?) will give (Old Syriac: cast) into your bosom (i.e., the fold of the flowing robe) a measure ("measure into the bosom" is an Old Testament phrase; cf. Is. 65:7; Ps. 79:12) that is good, pressed down, shaken together and overflowing. At the end of v. 38, Luke rejoins Mt. 7:2b.

vv. 39–40 Luke then introduces as a parable in question form what Mt. 15:14 puts positively and gives as spoken against the Pharisees. Can a blind man (successfully) lead a blind man? Will they not both fall into a pit (cf. the lion in 2 Sam. 23:20)? He thereupon passes on to the saying of Mt. 10:24–25, presumably with the transitional thought that one should seek a teacher who is not blind. A disciple is not above his teacher (in knowledge). The one who is fully taught will (at best) be like his teacher (this presupposes the Jewish ideal of exhaustively reproducing the knowledge received and not departing from it). The parallel idea in Matthew of a servant being like his master does not appear here.

vv. 41–42 Luke now adduces the "beam and mote" material almost exactly as in Mt. 7:3–5.

6:43–46 The Test of Goodness (Mt. 7: 16–21; 12:32–35). Each tree, good or bad, is known by its fruit, and produces consistently of the same quality. Similarly, the good man brings forth the good from the treasure of his heart (12:34). Out of the overflow of the heart, the mouth speaks. This material appears twice in Matthew (7:16 f.; 12:33 f.), with slight variations. V. 45 agrees closely with Mt. 12:35, but the concluding v. 46 "why do you address me 'my Lord, my Lord,' but do not do what I say?" is more akin to Mt. 7:21.

6:47–49 Concluding Parables (Mt. 7:24–27). Jesus here speaks of a man who builds a house and digs down deeply and puts the foundation on the rock; the one contrasted with him builds a house on the surface of the ground, without a foundation. Against the former's structure the flooding waters of the river break, but are not able to shake it because it is well built; the latter's collapses immediately in the same circumstances. This version may not be as vivid as Matthew's, but it is truer to reality, since no one is apt to build either on ledge or on sand.

7:1–10 The Centurion of Capernaum (Mt. 8:5–13; cf. Jn. 4:46–54), Q. This incident is not found in Mark, but appears in Matthew and is thus assigned to Q. (Jn. has a version of different origin.) As in Matthew, Jesus here goes to Capernaum, but Luke adds a connective element about the completion of the Sermon on the Plain. Instead of approaching Jesus in person, as related in Matthew, the centurion sends elders of the Jews to Jesus to request that he come and heal the centurion's servant, who is at death's door (not just a paralytic and in pain). The elders recommend the centurion to Jesus' consideration, saying that (though a Gentile by birth) he loves their people and has even built them their present synagogue (out of his private means). Jesus goes with them, but when he nears the house, a second delegation composed of friends of the centurion bring him the latter's message not to trouble himself (to come in person; cf. 8:49), for the centurion is not worthy that Jesus should come under his roof (this clashes with the request to come in v. 3), and therefore has felt unworthy to come to him personally. Let him speak only a word, and the servant will be healed. The story continues as in Mt. 8:9–10, but lacks vv. 11–12—Jesus' saying that the Gentiles will replace the Jews, which Luke has in 13:28–29. Jesus says "I say unto you: not (even) in Israel have I found such faith" (Codex D: "Never have I found such faith in Israel"). When those sent return to the house, they find the servant healed.

7:11–17 The Youth of Nain. Luke here adduces an incident belonging to his special material. By this means he paves the way for 7:22; in Matthew, a similar purpose is served by 9:18 f. The story is loosely connected with the preceding by "it happened thereafter." Jesus goes to "a city called Nain." Eusebius and Jerome identified it with a village near Mt. Tabor—presumably the place to which the name *Nēn* has clung through the centuries. A dead youth, the only son of a widow, was being carried out of the city for burial. "The Lord" (not used by Mark, but frequently by Luke, though the manuscripts differ and Codex D often does not have it) was filled with compassion and told the widow not to weep. The youth was being borne in a coffin (Gr. *sorós*). It was open, for the cover was not put on it until the interment. However, coffins were rarely used by the Jews (cf. Gen. 50:26, LXX; Jos. *Ant., 15,* 6, 26); ordinarily the body was borne on a pallet, and realistically speaking that would have been the case in a simple village burial. Jesus drew near and touched the coffin—a substitute for touching the body; but cf. 8:54. It is here construed as a signal to the bearers to halt. Jesus then said to the youth, "Arise." The youth sat up (as he was swathed in linen he could do no more) and began to speak. And Jesus gave him back to his mother (cf. 9:42). A great fear seized all, and they praised God in twofold manner, saying, "A great prophet has been awakened among us" and "God has visited his people" (in the beneficent sense, cf. 1:68, 78); the appearance of such a man is divinely caused. This "word" (here: report) then went out through all Judaea (in broad sense as 1:5?) and in the whole district. The allusion to all Judaea may have been added with an eye to 7:18; how else would John's disciples have heard about it?

7:18–23 The Question of John the Baptist (Mt. 11:2–6), Q. Luke, in contrast to Matthew, puts this material before the sending out of the Apostles. He expands the story somewhat, giving John's instruction to his disciples and their delivery of the message separately, and adding that in that hour of their arrival Jesus was performing healings. The latter item shows that he felt the need of explaining the words of Jesus' reply, in which there is reference to hearing and seeing (changed by Luke to "what you have seen and heard"). For the rest, Luke agrees with Matthew.

7:24–35 Jesus' Testimony concerning John (Mt. 11:7–19), Q

vv. 24–28 Luke and Matthew are in close accord here. In the answer to the second rhetorical question, Luke has "those who are gorgeously appareled and live in luxury" instead of "those who wear soft raiment." The antithesis to the rich is thus stronger. In the saying about John, Luke's phraseology differs slightly but significantly. "No one among those born of woman *is* greater than John, but the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." In Matthew, the praise of John was more sweeping: a greater never has arisen.

vv. 29–30 Luke does not have the saying about the violent here (Mt. 11:12–15; cf. Lk. 16:16), but introduces a piece of special material. It is to be taken as narration by Jesus; the people and the publicans justified God (= accepted his will as right) by submitting to John's baptism, while the Pharisees and "lawyers" (Gr. *nomikoí,* otherwise "scribes") set aside the will of God toward them by not being baptized. This could mean that they did not accept the mission of John as authoritative (cf. Jn. 1:25) or that they held the baptism of repentance inapplicable to themselves (3:3). A related piece is appended in Mt. 21:31–32 to the parable of the two sons.

vv. 31–35 Luke again parallels Matthew closely in the saying about the children in the market place. The concluding sentence, however, reads differently: "And wisdom is justified over against all her children." Luke's "children" is better than Matthew's "works." The "children of wisdom" are the Jews.

7:36–50 The Penitent Woman in the House of Simon (cf. Mk. 14:3–9; Mt. 26:6–13; Jn. 12:1–8). This narrative is from Lukes special material. It replaces Mark's anointing of Jesus in the house of a Simon *the Leper,* which he omits at the corresponding point. Since that story is impressive, one wonders why Luke made this change. As he has canceled out Bethany as place of sojourn of Jesus, even taking Martha and Mary to some undefined place in the north, it seems likely that this is the key also to the present transfer. That of course necessitated the dropping of the idea of an anointing with an eye to Jesus' burial. As in the incidents of 4:16 ff. and 5:1 ff., Luke's version of the event is of a secondary nature.

No localization is attempted. Jesus has been invited to dinner by a Pharisee (cf. 11:37; 14:1)—perhaps after speaking in a synagogue. The reception, however, was none too courteous, as vv. 44 f. shows. In the unnamed city was a woman who was a sinner—probably meaning a harlot. Her name is not given; Mary Magdalene of 8:2, with whom she is often identified, was a sick person, not a "sinner." Her entering into a company composed of banqueting men seems improbable from the angle of Jewish mores, but Hellenistic circles were accustomed to that sort of thing. Standing behind Jesus, at his feet (he was lying on his left side with his knees drawn forward, according to banqueting custom; cf. p. 312), she wept and thereby wet his feet with her tears and then wiped them dry with her hair (which implies that she took off her head covering and unbound her hair), kissed his feet (as a sign of the most heartfelt gratitude), and anointed them with precious myrrh (cf. Mt. 2:11) from an alabaster jar. The Pharisee who had invited him was saying to himself that if Jesus were a prophet he would know what kind of person she was, "for she is a sinner." Jesus, knowing his thoughts, says he has something to say to him. The Pharisee, calling him "teacher," invites him to proceed. [Jesus then relates the parable of a man who had two debtors, one owing him five hundred denarii, the other fifty; and when they could not pay, the man canceled their debts. Which one would love him the most? The Pharisee replies: "He to whom he gave the most." Jesus acknowledges the correctness of the reply.] With a gesture toward the woman as he speaks to Simon, Jesus points out that since he entered she has heaped upon him her loving ministrations, doing on a large scale what Simon has neglected to do on a lesser one, as required by courtesy. For Simon has given him no water wherewith he could bathe his feet, no kiss of salutation, nor poured oil on his head (Pss. 23:5; 133:2). (She has made good this omission.) Jesus declares to him that many sins are forgiven her (by God) because she loved much, as shown by her tears and ministrations, [while he to whom little is (i.e., needs to be) forgiven loves little]. And he says to the woman, "Thy sins are forgiven thee."

vv. 49–50. [His fellow diners say to themselves: "Who is this, that he forgives sins?" Jesus dismisses the woman with the words, "Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace."] Not what she has done, but the underlying motive that led her to do it—the belief in God's love and mercy as proclaimed by Jesus—have brought about her repentance and consequent salvation. (That her faith "saved" her would fit better with a healing narrative, such as one of Mary Magdalene.)

The narrative is the result of a fusion of diverse elements, whether made by Luke or someone before him. The basic combination is that of two variant stories: the one of a woman performing an anointing as an act of devotion, the other of a woman coming to Jesus as a penitent. The latter story became preponderant. The conclusion is really reached with the assurance of forgiveness in v. 48. The comment of the fellow diners in 7:49 and the saying of Jesus to the woman in v. 50, bracketed above, represent an extension, effected with the help of other story elements such as are found in Mk. 2:7 and 5:34. The parable of the two debtors in vv. 41–42, with the dialogue of v. 43, as well as the moral drawn in v. 47b, are also separate materials that have been artificially built into the compilation.

8:1–3 The Ministering Women. Jesus departs from Capernaum and wanders through cities and villages, proclaiming and preaching the kingdom of God. This is not a new development, but a continuation of the peripatetic ministry already described. It seems likely that Luke has merely taken this over editorially because of what follows. The Twelve were with Jesus, and also some women who had been healed of evil and sick spirits (cf. 7:21). Their mention here obviates the necessity of repeating in 23:49 all that Mark said in 15:40. They were: (1) Mary the one called Magdalene (because from Magdala, also called Tarichaea, on the lake of Galilee, north of Tiberias), from whom seven demons (cf. 11:26) had gone out; (2) Joanna (widowed) wife of Chuza, steward of Herod Antipas ("Chuza" corresponds to "Kuza," a name found in Nabataean inscriptions); (3) Susanna (otherwise unknown); and many others who ministered to them (Jesus and the disciples) out of their possessions. How such group travels with women followers could be carried out in Jewish lands remains obscure. It seems likely that the evangelists are projecting into the past things that were possible in the Graeco-Roman world. Actually these women may have extended hospitality in their homes only, and given money for the cause. The names of the women were not derived from Mark, who records only the first of those mentioned here, although he does list several different ones.

8:4–8 Parable of the Sower (Mk. 4:1–9; Mt. 13:1–9. In the rest of this first part of his book—from 8:4 to 9:50—Luke confines himself to materials from Mark whom he forsook in 6:16. He here omits the lakeside setting of Mark's account, but his words imply that Jesus was at some place where a large crowd was with him, and people from neighboring cities were streaming out to him. The parable is introduced with "he said in a parable," but the invitation "hear ye" of Mark is omitted.

Luke also abridges the parable itself. In the remark about the seed along the way, he adds that it was trodden under foot. In the phrase "birds *of heaven,*" the italicized words are missing in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac; they were probably supplied from Matthew's version. Mark's seed falling on "rocky ground," here falls on "the rock," and on sprouting withers on account of not having moisture (Mark's more vivid detail is omitted). In the case of the seed fallen on good soil, he mentions only its bringing hundredfold fruit.

8:9–10 The Reason for Parables (Mk. 4:10–12; Mt. 13:10–15). In the request for an explanation there is no reference to a plurality of parables, but only to this particular one, and those asking are only "the disciples." In his reply Jesus speaks of their being given the *knowledge* of the "mysteries" (so also Mt.; Mk.: mystery) of the kingdom of God. Mk. 4:12 is abridged. God's purpose is limited to keeping the public in ignorance.

8:11–15 The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mk. 4:13–20; Mt. 13:18–23). For Mk. 4:13, Luke simply substitutes, "This is (the meaning of) the parable." The seed is identified as the Word of God (for Lk.: the Christian message). The Devil takes the Word away from the heart of those who are like the seed fallen by the wayside. In the case of those like the seed that fell among thorns, Luke mentions their believing for a while and then falling away in the time of temptation (Mk.: persecution). Those like the seed fallen on good soil hold the Word fast in a fair and good heart and bring fruit enduringly. (It is not clear whether the final word carries out the plant symbolism or whether the fruit-bearing is allegorized as Christian living with patient endurance, cf. Rom. 2:7—, in this case of trials.)

8:16–18 Concerning the Right Use of Parables (Mk. 4:21–25). In Luke there is no indication of the start of a new saying. What Mark has in the form of questions is here put in the form of a statement. Luke speaks of covering the light with a vessel (Mk.: bushel), and in connection with putting it on the lampstand he adds "that those who enter may see the light." The invitation to hear, which terminates the saying in Mark, is dropped. The saying on measuring was already used in 6:38.

The further parables of Mk. 4:26–34 are left out; that of the mustard seed and the leaven are included later in 13:18–21.

8:19–21 Jesus' True Relatives (Mk. 3:31–35; Mt. 12:46–50). Luke here introduces, with abridgment, the story about the relatives. Had he followed Mark's order, he would have put it before the Sermon on the Plain (6:20 f.). It is quite possible that his placement of it here, after mention of the faithful of 8:1 f. and of the authority of the disciples (8:9), has the purpose of downgrading the Lord's kinsmen to a still greater degree.

Jesus is imagined as surrounded by a crowd (hence outdoors), but, rather inconsistently, the message is brought to him indoors. The relatives want to see him—perhaps, like Herod in 9:9 and 23:8, in the hope of seeing him perform a miracle. Jesus declares that his true relatives are those who hear the Word of God and do it (Mk.: whoever does the will of God). Having belatedly brought this episode in, and omitting Mk. 4:26–34, Luke can again follow Mark.

8:22–25 The Calming of the Tempest (Mk. 4:35–41; Mt. 8:23–27). Mark's allusion to "that day when evening came" and Jesus' dismissal of the crowd are omitted. "On one of the days" Jesus, followed by his disciples, entered a boat. The story itself is abridged and the wording changed considerably; Luke notes that *they were in danger* when the boat was filling with water. The disciples, in waking Jesus, say, "Master, Master, we are perishing." (Mk.: "Teacher, dost thou not care if we perish?") Jesus asks: "Where is your faith?" (Mk.: "How (is it) that you do not have faith?")

8:26–39 The Gerasene Demoniac (Mk. 5:1–20; Mt. 8:28–34). Luke notes that the land of the Gerasenes (variants: Gadarenes, Gergesenes; cf. on Mk.) to which

Jesus goes lies opposite Galilee. In this Gospel this is Jesus' only venture into a foreign environment. The demoniac, according to Luke's report, for a long time had worn no clothes and did not live in a house (his own, Mk. 5:19), but in the tombs. Luke recognizes the inappropriateness of having the demon (who is speaking out of the man) adjure Jesus "by God" and omits that phrase. The demon on being asked his name confines himself to giving it; Mark's "because we are many" is changed to an explanation that many demons had entered the man. They beseech Jesus not to command them to go away into the abyss (Mk.: out of the country). This evidently means "hell," though ordinarily the demons are conceived of as going there only after the world judgment. Luke, like Matthew, does not estimate the number of the swine. In v. 37 he intensifies: all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked Jesus to leave because they were seized with a great fear. The man proclaimed through the whole city (Mk.: "in the Decapolis," a term Luke avoids) what Jesus had done to him.

8:40–56 The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood (Mk. 5:21–43; Mt. 9:18–26)

vv. 40–42a Luke relates the appeal of Jairus in the third person, mentioning that the daughter was an only one and giving her age as twelve years.

vv. 42b–48 In speaking of the woman with the issue of blood, Luke abridges; he omits that she had suffered much from many physicians, etc., and merely states that she could not be healed by anyone; he says nothing of how she joined the throng. A slightly different presentation is given of Jesus' reaction to being touched. Peter, who is singled out ("and those with him" is missing in Codex B and the Old Syriac), explains, "Master, crowds hem thee in and press upon thee." Jesus insisted that someone touched him, for he noticed that strength had gone forth from him. Luke omits Jesus' "looking around to see who had done it." Instead, he says that the woman, seeing that she could not remain concealed, came, and, before all the people, explained why she had done it and that she had been healed straightway. Mark's "be healed of thy disease" is changed to "go in peace" (cf. 7:50).

vv. 49–56 Luke mentions only a single messenger and lets him give an admonition: "Do not trouble the teacher." Jairus is told, "Only believe and *she will be saved.*" Luke makes it plain that Jesus took the three disciples into the house with the father and mother. The exchange with the mourners comes in belatedly; their laughing at the remark of Jesus is explained with their knowing that the girl had died. Luke omits the Aramaic words quoted by Mark; Jesus simply says, "Child, arise." Luke then notes that "her spirit returned"—thus seeking to nail down that this was indeed an awakening of a dead person (which is not so certain in view of v. 52 = Mk. 5:39).

9:1–6 The Sending out of the Disciples (Mk. 6:6–13; Mt. 9:35–11:1). Having used the visit of Jesus to Nazareth earlier (4:16 f.), Luke passes on to the sending out of the Twelve. In Mk. 6:7 f. this sending out occurred in the Nazareth locality. All geographical background is lost here. Jesus gives the Twelve power also to heal diseases (Mk. only: over unclean spirits, but cf. Mk. 6:13). Nothing is said of their being sent out in pairs. In Mark they were allowed to take a staff and wear sandals, but in Luke they are denied these comforts. The "place" that does not receive them here is a "city." In Mark they went forth proclaiming repentance; here they "preach." Luke omits Mark's reference to exorcism and healings by anointing, and simply says that they healed everywhere.

9:7–9 Herod's Opinion of Jesus (Mk. 6:14–16; Mt. 14:1–2). Luke omits Mark's statement that Jesus' name had become known. He describes Herod as perplexed at what he heard people say about Jesus, but does not let him take a standpoint, as in Mark. Herod merely says: "John I beheaded, but who is this one concerning whom I hear these things?" Luke adds that Herod sought to see Jesus. He makes no use of Mark's story of the death of the Baptist; perhaps he had different and better information, since he knows about persons who had been close to Herod's court (8:3; Acts 13:1).

9:10–17 The Return of the Disciples and the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:30–44; Mt. 14:13–21; cf. Jn. 6:1–13). Mark's story of the return of the twelve Apostles is abridged. Instead of trying to provide a retreat for them, Jesus withdraws with them to a city (Codex D: village) called Bethsaida. But the feeding of the multitude requires a desert area (Codex S and the Old Syriac therefore substitute "to a desert place" for "to Bethsaida," while the received text combines both; cf. A.V.). In v. 12 Luke changes Mark's "disciples" to "the Twelve." Jesus does not command the people to sit down—he bids the disciples attend to that. Codex D omits "and they made them sit down" in v. 15 and "and he broke them" in v. 16; the former is superfluous and the latter does not fit the fishes.

9:18–22 The Messianic Confession of Peter; the First Passion Announcement (Mk. 8:27–33; Mt. 16:13–23). Luke retains Jesus praying alone after the feeding of the five thousand (Mk. 6:46), but if the text continues "the disciples *were with him,*" this can scarcely be correct. Codex B reads, "the disciples *came to him,*" which seems better. Luke thus omits the departure of the disciples and the reunion with them, Mk. 6:45, 51, along with the story of the walking on the sea. Furthermore, he leaves out everything between Mk. 6:44 and 8:27. The reader gets the impression that what is related in 9:18 f. occurred in the same desert place as the feeding of the multitude. Caesarea Philippi evidently meant nothing to him.

In the reply of the disciples to Jesus' question as to who people say he is, Luke clarifies Mark's "one of the prophets" as in 9:8: "some prophet of the ancients has risen." Peter's confession has the form, "Thou art the Christ of God" (cf. 2:26), but in the Sinaitic Syriac "of God" is missing, as it is in Mark. With the charge to tell this to no one, Luke closely connects the first announcement of the Passion. For the resurrection "on the third day," Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac read "after three days." Peter's rebuke (Mk. 8:32–33) is omitted as detracting from the prestige of the Apostle.

9:23–27 The Disciples' Path of Suffering (Mk. 8:34–9:1; Mt. 16:24–28). Luke has Jesus speak *to all* (Mk.: to the crowd and his disciples; Mt.: to his disciples). In connection with "losing one's life," he omits "for the sake of the Gospel," as does Matthew. The saying "what does it profit a man" is changed slightly in the conclusion to "destroying or forfeiting himself," thereby suggesting that there are other ways of losing one's soul than by saving one's life. In v. 26 Luke, like Matthew, does not have Mark's "in this adulterous and sinful generation." The Marcan prediction about some persons living to see the kingdom coming in power is altered to "seeing the kingdom of God." This could be interpreted nonapocalyptically, e.g., as completion of the process prophesied in 24:47. The passage is important for Luke's idea of the kingdom and his deferment of the Second Coming.

9:28–36 The Transfiguration (Mk. 9:2–8; Mt. 17:1–8). The introductory "it happened after these words (= things)" is Old Testament phraseology (cf. Gen. 15:1; 22:1). Luke lengthens the interval between the Messianic confession and this event to eight days. In the mention of the sons of Zebedee, John is put before James, though this could have occurred in text transmission; in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac, James stands first. Jesus goes up the mountain to pray, and while praying has this experience (cf. also 3:21). Luke avoids the word "metamorphosed," saying instead that the appearance of Jesus' countenance became other (Gr. *héteros*) and his garment white and shining. (Luke thus shortens Mark's description.) Instead of reporting the appearance of Moses and Elias, he says that "two men spoke with him, who were Moses and Elias," but he notes that they had "appeared in glory" and that they spoke of Jesus' "departure" (Gr. *éxodos*) "which he was about to fulfill in Jerusalem." Peter and his companions were sound asleep (this suggests that it was night). When they awoke (at dawn?) they saw the glory of Jesus and the two men standing with him. When the latter were about to depart, Peter made his suggestion of erecting booths. That the disciples were afraid (Mk. 9:6) is left out at this point and transferred to the moment when the two visitors "enter the cloud" (cf. Ex. 24:18, LXX). In the utterance of the voice from the cloud, "beloved Son" is changed to "chosen Son." The fear of the disciples is based on the awesome cloud rather than on seeing the three persons "in glory." According to Luke, the three did not in those days tell anyone about what they had seen. This was esoteric information which they mentioned later (cf. Mk. 16:8).

9:37–43a The Healing of an Epileptic Boy (Mk. 9:14–29; Mt. 17:14–21). Luke puts the descent from the mountain "on the following day" after the nocturnal experience. In view of 9:36, he omits Jesus' command of silence as well as the discussion about the return of Elijah before the resurrection and describes the crowds as coming to meet Jesus. This necessitates omission of the arguing of the scribes with the disciples. The surprise of the crowd at seeing Jesus and hearing his question are passed over. The father of the boy beseeches Jesus directly for help for the child, explaining that this is his only son. Whereas in Mark the boy is afflicted with a dumb spirit, he here is described as crying out *suddenly* when "a spirit" seizes him. (In Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac, the spirit is described as suddenly seizing and *rending* him.) The spirit, hardly departing from the lad (even temporarily), wears him out. The story of the healing is abridged by Luke. Jesus asks no question about the history of the ailment; there is no new appeal by the father or insistence on the necessity of faith on his part, nor is the thought expressed that the boy was dead. The exorcismal command is not quoted, nor does Jesus take the boy by the hand. Luke merely reports that he rebuked the unclean spirit and (thus) healed the boy and gave him back to his father. The private conversation between Jesus and his disciples (Mk. 9:28–29) is left out, but a suitable conclusion is provided with the remark that all were astonished at God's greatness (as revealed in Jesus' healing power).

9:43b–45 The Second Passion Announcement (Mk. 9:30–32; Mt. 17:22–23). Luke joins this closely to the preceding situation instead of putting it later during secret wanderings in Galilee. The prediction is shortened to a deliverance into the hands of men. The disciples' lack of comprehension is emphasized by repetition in synonymous phrases.

9:46–48 The Dispute concerning Rank (Mk. 9:33–37; Mt. 18:1–5). Luke leaves out Jesus' return to Capernaum and the question addressed to the disciples. He says merely that a thought arose concerning who among them was the most important. Jesus does not call the Twelve or make the statement of Mk. 9:35 (cf. below). Emphasizing that Jesus knew the thought of their heart, Luke has him proceed directly to the episode with the child. Instead of setting the child in the midst of the disciples, Jesus places the child at his side, and the act of embracing is omitted. Jesus says, "Whoever receives this child (Mk.: one of these children) in my name, etc." Luke ends the section with a saying similar in meaning to the one omitted in Mk. 9:35: "He who is least among you all, this one is great!"

9:49–50 The Strange Exorcist (Mk. 9:38–41). Addressing Jesus as "Master" (Mk.: Teacher), John says that they hindered the exorcist "because he does not follow *with us*" (Mk.: one who does not follow us). The reply of Jesus is much abridged—Luke merely uses the command not to hinder him and the dictum of Mk. 9:40, put into the second person plural.

(PART II) LUKE'S TRAVEL SECTION

9:51–18:14

Luke here departs from Mark and introduces a compilation of materials, many of which are exclusively reported by him. He rejoins Mark's sequence in 18:15 (= Mk. 10:13). The period of wanderings in Galilee with which the previous section dealt is seemingly ended; a definite goal of travel is now entertained. Actually, however, this is not carried through with any realism. What Luke is mainly interested in is to present a new and higher level of teaching by Christ. The occasional travel references are only "marking time." In 13:1 the scene is still Galilee and in 17:11 Jesus is north of the boundary of Samaria.

9:51–56 The Samaritan Village. This is special material of Luke. He has an impressive formulation for this new phase of the ministry of Jesus. "It came to pass when the days of his 'assumption' (Gr. *analēmpsis,* i.e., elevation to heaven—the only occurrence of this word in the New Testament) were becoming full that he turned his face (cf. Gen. 31:21) to go to Jerusalem." Since he is described as coming to a Samaritan village, it would seem that according to Luke (contrary to Mk. and Mt.) he intended to take the route through Samaria rather than through the Jordan valley. Luke shows him free from any bias against the Samaritans (contrary to Mt. 10:5).

The Samaritans, however, were not all imbued with the spirit of the hero of Jesus' parable in 10:30 ff. Pilgrimage of Galileans to Jerusalem through their territory was aggravating to them, since they regarded Mt. Gerizim as the place God had chosen for his sanctuary. Hence the messengers sent ahead by Jesus to find accommodations were refused such in a border village. According to a tradition tied in with this incident, their attitude provoked James and John, who allegedly asked whether they should call down fire from heaven (i.e., lightning) to devour these people. The miracle, of course, required Jesus' permission—in effect, then, being a delegation of his power. It was evidently suggested by the example of Elijah (2 Kings 1:10, 12), and Codex D actually has "as Elijah did" at the end of v. 54. That makes this another instance of Jesus' being put in parallelism with that prophet. Jesus turns and rebukes the two disciples. Codex D quotes him as saying, "Do you not know of what manner of spirit you are?" Some codices and the Old Syriac version also have the further remark, "The son of man is not come to destroy but to save" (cf. 19:10; Jn. 3:17; 1 Tim. 1:15). One may suspect that a story attempting to explain how the two disciples received the nickname "sons of thunder" (Mk. 3:17) has here been utilized by Luke. Jesus then goes on to another village—not necessarily a Samaritan one (cf. 17:11). Actually, Luke has no interest in the geography of the Jerusalem journey.

9:57–60 Diverse Followers (Mt. 8:19–22), Q. In his opening words, Luke introduces the travel idea, but only vaguely. The piece may have been placed here primarily to put some distance between 9:52 and 10:1 ff. The subject matter excellently suits the beginning of the theme: going to Jerusalem. "Following Jesus" now acquires a deeper meaning for the reader. Three individuals, illustrating different attitudes, are introduced in quick succession. The first is not a scribe, as in Matthew, but just "a certain one" who volunteers to go along, and he does not address Jesus as "teacher." However, the reply of Jesus is identical with that found in Matthew. The second is not "another of the disciples" (in the broader sense), as in Matthew, but simply another person, and hence does not use the word "Lord" in answering the invitation. (Matthew does not record the invitation, but presupposes it.) The response of Jesus is as in Matthew, except that he adds "but go and preach the kingdom of God." The third individual is without counterpart in Matthew and may have been added by Luke to round out a triad. He addresses Jesus as "Lord" and volunteers to follow, but wants permission to take leave first of those in his house. Jesus declares that no one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back (taking his eyes off the objective) is well adapted for (the business of) the kingdom of God —a particularly vivid and effective saying for a rural audience.

10:1–16 The Mission of the Seventy (cf. Mt. 9:37 f.; 10:16; 10:9–10a, 11–13, 10:10b; 10:7–8, 14–15; 11:21–23; 10:40), Q

vv. 1–12 In 9:1–6 Jesus has sent out twelve disciples with brief instructions. He now sends out seventy others (in the Sinaitic Syriac, seventy-two). Whether the number was suggested by the seventy peoples of Gen. 10 (in the LXX text, seventy-two) or by the elders of Ex. 24:1, Num. 11:16, is hard to say. He dispatched them "before his face" in pairs to every city and place to which he himself wanted to go, to give news of his impending arrival. They thus had no such independent ministry as he had previously assigned to the Twelve. In reality, however, this is a duplication of the sending out of the Twelve, for it is unsupported by the other evangelists, and Luke himself later refers back to 10:4 in words which Jesus addresses to the Twelve (22:35). The idea of giving Jesus a larger body of disciples in addition to the Twelve was evidently developed to meet the claims of others to some recognition. Originally there were many who bore the title of "apostle"—it is Luke who seeks to restrict it to the Twelve. This new group of disciples is appointed with an eye to missions, though the Gentiles are not yet brought into view.

Jesus describes the missionary opportunity by speaking of the plentiful harvest and few laborers (Mt. 9:37–38), and refers to the hazards of the work with the saying about sending them as lambs among wolves (Mt. 10:16a, omitting 16b). As Matthew's divergent placement shows, the two items are artificially joined. Then follow directions corresponding to those given the Twelve in Mt. 10:7–15, though in different order and with slight divergences. Instead of the allusion to not acquiring money for their belts (Mt. 10:9), Luke mentions not taking along a purse (evidently the customary coin carrier known to his readers; cf. 12:33). No reference is made to the garments or staff. He adds, however, that they are not to salute anyone on the way—a reflection of the hurried nature of the early Christian mission activity in the face of the supposed imminent end of the world. The greeting to the house of Mt. 10:12 appears in more developed form in 10:5; Matthew's "worthy man" here is called "a son of peace." The remark about the laborer deserving his *food* (Mt. 10:10) is changed to "the laborer deserves his *wages*" and prefaced with the instruction that they are to eat and drink the things the people have. They are not to change from one house to another. A separate paragraph (vv. 8–12) is devoted to entering a city (contrast the combination "house or city" in Mt. 10:14); it is evidently there, rather than in the house as at first (Mk. 2:1; 3:20, 32) that the preaching is now being done. If received, they are to eat what is set before them, and heal the sick (note omission of other items of Mt. 10:8); and they are to say to the people: "The kingdom of God is come near to you" (in the prospective arrival of Jesus?). The departure from the hostile city is made more vivid than in Mt. 10:14. They are to go out into its streets and declare that they are *wiping off* (instead of shaking off) against them (i.e., the people; cf. Mk. 6:11) the dust of their city that clings to their feet. A final repetition of the message is enjoined: people are to know that the kingdom is near. "On that day" (when the kingdom comes) the Sodomites will fare better than the city rejecting them (cf. Mt. 10:15).

vv. 13–16 Without any special introduction Luke puts here the "woes over Galilean cities"—Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (= Mt. 11:20–24). According to his intention these illustrate Jesus' attitude toward cities rejecting the Seventy. However, that was not their original purpose. The instructions close with a saying like that in Mt. 10:40 ("who receives you receives me")—a reversion to vv. 1–12 for the purpose of tying in vv. 17–20. It shows that the sending of the Seventy is parallel to the sending of the messengers in 9:52.

10:17–20 The Return of the Seventy. This is special material of Luke. The Seventy came back with joy, reporting that they had been able to drive out demons in Jesus' name, i.e., with use of his name in the exorcism (though, unlike the disciples in 9:1, they had not been especially given this authority in 10:9—unless this was omitted by a copyist. Jesus said that he saw Satan fall from heaven like a bolt of lightning. He is evidently foreseeing Satan's sudden downfall (cf. Jn. 12:31; Is. 14:12. One may note here that according to Enoch 44 lightnings evolve from the stars). He then declares that he now is (even) giving them power to walk over serpents and scorpions and over all the might of the enemy (evidently with an eye to the later activities of apostolic missionaries). But they are not to rejoice over the subjection of the evil spirits; they are rather to rejoice that their names are written in heaven (in the book recording those who are to be delivered; Dan. 12:1). It is peculiar that the power over the demons is first treated as important (v. 17) and now is played down as insignificant in comparison with the consciousness of being among the elect!

10:21–22 The Utterance of Rejoicing (Mt. 11:25–27), Q. Luke then appends Jesus' prayer of thanksgiving. He introduces it with the statement that in that same hour Jesus *rejoiced in the Holy Spirit* (not in Mt.). Before the declaration of Mt. 11:27, he adds, "Then turning to his disciples, he said." Instead of "no one knows the Son except the father, etc.," he has "no one knows who the Son is except the Father" and vice versa.

10:23–24 Blessed Eyewitness (Mt. 13:16–17), Q. Luke puts here the Beatitude upon the eyes that see what the disciples had seen. He prefaces it with Jesus' turning to the disciples privately (Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac merely have "he said to them"). In place of Matthew's "prophets and righteous men," Luke has "prophets and kings."

10:25–29 The Greatest Commandment (Mk. 12:28–34; Mt. 22:34–40). This rests on Mark, and Luke leaves it out after 20:40, where one would have expected to find it. He makes the interrogator a lawyer (Gr. *nomikós,* cf. 7:30, expert in the Mosaic Law; Mk. "scribe") who stood up to put Jesus to the test (in Mk. he comes in sincerity) by asking what he must do to inherit eternal life? Whereupon Jesus asks the counterquestion of what the (Mosaic) Law has to say on this subject? The man replies with Deut. 6:6 (omitting "with all thy strength") and Lev. 19:18, running them together without a break. Jesus tells him he has answered correctly; let him do this and he will "live" (= inherit eternal life.) What was a teaching of Jesus in Mark is here attributed to the lawyer.

The incident is given an extension in vv. 29. The man wants to justify himself (for having put a question he was able to answer himself) and asks, "Who is my neighbor?" This extension seems to be artificially made in order to provide an occasion for bringing in what follows.

10:30–37 Parable of the Good Samaritan. This is the first of four great parables of Jesus—all special material of Luke (cf. 15:11–32; 16:19–31; 18:9–14). Originally this particular one must have been addressed to a Jerusalem audience; its placement here is thus purely editorial. The road from the Mount of Olives to Jericho runs through the wilderness of Judah (a distance of seventeen miles). Hold-ups and acts of violence were common occurrences there at times when there was no strong national government. Roman occupation forces were too few in number to keep order. The man who fell among the robbers thus is representative of numerous others who fared similarly. For Jesus to say that "*by chance* a priest was going down this road" would not have surprised his hearers, for Jericho was the chief priestly city. At the same time it increased the effect of the story to have members of religious orders callously ignore the basic moral requirement of giving help when encountering need. But making a Samaritan the noble rescuer must have been a jolt to Jesus' listeners. These people, who are regularly called "Cuthaeans" (cf. 2 Kings 17:30) in rabbinic texts, were particularly despised by the Jews. The Samaritan had compassion, went to the man and bandaged his wounds, pouring "oil and wine" into them. (That he happened to have both with him is one of those implausibilities which a good storyteller makes the hearer or reader overlook.) While oil alone is mentioned in Is. 1:6 as dressing for wounds, the use of the two, one as healing and the other as disinfecting agent, is well attested from classical antiquity. The "inn" to which the Samaritan takes the victim and where he nursed him for the night is a rather mysterious entity. Very little is known even from Hellenistic-Roman sources about inns and inn-keeping. There was scarcely a nearby counterpart to the modern so-called "Inn of the Good Samaritan" in those days; the hostelry in question must be sought at Jericho. The charitable Samaritan not only paid the innkeeper two *denarii* to board and take care of the man, but promised to give him more on his return if the patient could not be discharged as soon as expected. When Jesus in completing the story asked the lawyer, "Which of these three seems to thee to have become neighbor to the one who fell among the robbers?" that individual in his aversion for the very word "Samaritan" says, "The one who did the (act of) mercy with (= to) him." Jesus tells him to go and do likewise. (Even if it were a Samaritan who needed aid, the act of mercy would still be obligatory upon whoever first confronted the situation.) Jesus thus has greatly extended the concept of neighbor, which to his contemporaries applied only to one's fellow Jew. A by-product has been the acquisition of an honorable connotation by the word "Samaritan." The effect of this parable on Christian history has been enormous, and its challenge can never be exhausted.

10:38–42 Mary and Martha. In the course of travel (this by way of keeping up the idea of progression), Jesus comes to a village where a (widow-?) woman named Martha extended hospitality (evidently not only to Jesus but to as many as she could accommodate). Her young sister Mary (Gr. *Mariam*), perhaps not yet of marriageable age (cf. p. 120), sits in rapt attention at the feet of the Lord and hears his Word, leaving Martha to cope with all the work. In ill-humor the housewife asks Jesus whether he does not care (cf. Mk. 4:38) that her sister is letting her serve alone? (He should tell her to help.) But Jesus defends Mary. The reply is given in several forms in the manuscripts, suggestive of various interpretations. (1) The received text has: "Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things; *but one thing is needful* (namely hearing the Word); and Mary has chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her (by my telling her to go and help you in the portion you chose, of attending to practical needs)." (2) In the oldest manuscripts, however, we find instead of the italicized words: *of few things* [*or of one*] *there is need.* But the *or of one* is evidently a revisionist remark; it eventually gained the ascendancy, ousted the older *of few things* and thus led to the received text reading. If one discounts this element and reads *of few things there is need,* then Jesus was referring to his own modest requirements as to food. (3) In Codex D there is only one Greek word after "Martha, Martha" —namely the one meaning "thou art troubled" (unduly). (4) In the Sinaitic Syriac and some Old Latin texts even that word is missing, and the reading is: "Martha, Martha! Mary has chosen the good part, etc." That could be the oldest text form because it is the shortest, and is sufficient. In the received text, the saying of Jesus has been made more impressive.

Luke does not know the location of the village where Mary and Martha lived. The Fourth Gospel identifies it with Bethany near Jerusalem (Jn. 11). But the Synoptic story of the Passion does not mention these sisters in connection with that town. The implication of Luke certainly is that they lived elsewhere, for at this point in the narrative Jesus is still traveling in the direction of Jerusalem and has not yet reached Jericho. However, Luke's geographical ideas are hazy at best and it is not impossible that he has put this story here arbitrarily. Like Mark he knows of only one Jerusalem journey, and he could not use the episode in 19:28 f.

11:1–4 The Lord's Prayer (Mt. 6:9–13). Luke gives an introductory statement not found in Matthew. When Jesus was at a certain place, praying, and had ended, one of his disciples asked him to teach them to pray, just as John had taught his disciples. In Matthew no such purpose is revealed; Jesus is merely giving an example of the proper contents of a prayer. Luke, however, makes it a prescribed prayer. Jesus introduces it with "when you pray, say." It is not impossible that the prayer was brought forward in the Church under the stimulus of the ritual set up by the rival sect of the followers of the Baptist. Since the first sentence, as pointed out on p. 134, is not a petition but an introductory utterance of praise, Luke's petitions are: (1) Thy kingdom come, cf. Mt. 6:10. (2) Our bread, the needful (? cf. Mt. 6:11), give us—*that according to the day*. Luke thus does not have Matthew's "this day," but has the italicized words modifying "bread." A Semitic phrase such as the ones of Gen. 39:10 or 2 Chr. 8:14 meaning "day by day," "daily" underlies (cf. Acts 17:11). (3) Forgive us our sins as we forgive everyone owing us, and do not lead us into (further) temptation (to sin). Number 3 seems to be only a single petition—not two! The Lucan form of the prayer is thus exceedingly brief. But that very fact argues for greater originality than Matthew's richer, ecclesiastically more satisfying form. It is improbable that the fuller form would have been abridged had it been the older.

Jesus wanted to set forth the attitude his followers should take, the things that should be uppermost in their mind. The points brought forward here are the most direct concerns of his message. The elements composing the prayer are all in the range of Jewish piety, but what is omitted is as significant as what is mentioned. Compare, e.g., the petition for the coming kingdom in the ancient Jewish prayer, the Qaddish:

> May his kingdom reign in your lifetime, and in your days and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel at once, and in time close at hand. And say ye: Amen!

The brief petition of Jesus, "Thy kingdom come," has dropped the national interest and taken on universalism.

11:5–8 Parable of the Friend at Midnight. Luke introduces special material here. Jesus does not relate a story, but describes a possible situation. Who of his hearers would act in the following manner? Suppose one has a friend who knocks at his door in the middle of the night for the purpose of borrowing bread to set before an unexpected visitor, and suppose he were to say to that friend: "Do not cause me trouble! The door is already locked, and the children are with me in bed (primitive situation, as in pioneer life). I cannot get up to give thee (bread)." Jesus declares his hearers would not so act. If a man did not rise up and give his friend what he needed out of friendship, he would do so on account of his insistence. The thought is similar to 18:7: how much more will God help the one in distress when importuned in prayer! The parable or illustration is really a commentary on the petition of the Lord's prayer for bread, though not limited to that, since "bread" may be taken figuratively.

11:9–13 The Answer to Prayer (Mt. 7:7–11), Q. In this connection, where prayer is being dealt with, Luke has material which Matthew has put in the Sermon on the Mount. He does not have the bread-and-stone item of Mt. 7:9, but adds "or if he asks for an egg will give him a scorpion." More important is the divergence in the final promise. God will give *the Holy Spirit* (Mt.: good things) to them that ask him. The era of the Church is thus made the objective from the standpoint of Jesus' time.

11:14–23 Jesus and Beelzebul (Mt. 12:22–30, Q; cf. Mk. 3:22–27). Luke has omitted this discourse in chap. 8, where he was following Mark; here he adduces it from Q. Matthew adhered to Mark's order, but also utilized Q. The demoniac who provides the occasion for the discourse is only dumb in Luke (Mt.: blind and dumb). The crowds are amazed at the healing of the man, but do not ask the question whether Jesus is the Son of David (Mt. 12:23). Instead, some from among them (Mt.: the Pharisees) make the assertion about his driving out the demons by Beelzebul. Luke adds that others wanted to tempt him and sought a sign from heaven from him (anticipating 11:29). The separate illustrations of the divided kingdom and house (Mk. 3:24–25; Mt. 12:25) are fused here; "house falls upon house" (in the divided *kingdom*). The words about Satan's kingdom (Mk. 3:26; Mt. 12:26) appear in clearer form: "If Satan is divided against himself how will his kingdom stand?" In vv. 19–20 we find Q material (= Mt. 12:27–28). In vv. 21 f. the saying about the strong man's house (Mk. 3:27, Mt. 12:29) is considerably elaborated and raised above the level of mere housebreaking. When such a one, well armed, guards his residence, his possessions are "in peace" (= secure). But if a stronger one come and conquer him, he takes his panoply on which he relied and distributes the booty (to his soldiers). The concluding v. 23 (= Mt. 12:30) is from Q.

11:24–26 Saying on Relapse (Mt. 12:43–45), Q. Luke continues with the Q material devoted to this theme, whereas Matthew first interjects other materials (Mt. 12:31–42) before proceeding with it. The Lucan text is virtually identical with Matthew's, but he does not have the final prediction for "this evil generation" (Mt. 12:45).

11:27–28 Blessedness of Jesus' Mother. This is special material of Luke. A woman's praise of Jesus' mother is rejected by him: those rather are to be praised who hear and keep the Word of God. It is perhaps basically a variant of, or at least substitute for, Mk. 3:31–35. The saying of Jesus was already used in 8:21, where, however, "doing" rather than "keeping" of the Word of God is found (cf. Acts 7:53).

11:29–32 Against Seeking for Signs (Mt. 12:38–42), Q. Luke used the demand for a sign in 11:16, and so omits the occasion in Mt. 12:38, where scribes and Pharisees desire to see a sign. Instead, Jesus here addresses the gathering crowds. The explanation of the sign of Jonah is given in a different, more original form than in Matthew: "As Jonah became a sign (of the coming judgment) for the Ninevites, so the Son of man will be (a sign) to this generation." However, in Luke the item about the queen of Sheba in v. 31 is wrongly placed before v. 32, the one about the men of Nineveh, which forms the appropriate continuation of v. 30.

11:33–36 About Light (Mt. 5:15, 6:22–23), Q. What led Luke to put this material here is not immediately apparent. Perhaps his thought was that signs are not needed, the lamp of salvation has been set where all eyes can see it. The piece is composed of two sayings that are separated in Matthew. The first, about putting a lamp under something, is already found in 8:16, in slightly different form, in dependence on Mk. 4:21. Here it parallels Mt. 5:15, but with the additional possibility mentioned of putting the lamp into a "cellar" (Gr. *kryptē,* a covered hole). Luke has a singular subject, "no one," instead of Matthew's plural "they." The lamp on the stand has the purpose of enabling those who enter to see the light. The other saying runs parallel (through v. 34) to Mt. 6:22–23a, but differs from 23b; it warns men to be careful lest the light in them be darkness (Mt.: if that happens how great is the darkness). There is also added in v. 36 material not found in Matthew. The verse is omitted in Codex D, the Old Syriac, and most Latin manuscripts, but perhaps only because of its difficulty. "If thy whole body is light, not having any part dark, the whole will be light, as when the lamp illuminates thee with its radiance." The thought apparently is that the only true illumination is one that pervades the entire life of a man.

11:37–12:1 Discourse against Pharisaism (Mt. 23:25–26, 23, 6–7, 27, 4, 29–31, 34–36, 13), Q

vv. 37–41 Luke puts this discourse in an entirely different setting than Matthew did, perhaps under the influence of Mk. 7:1 f., which he had omitted, but on which he draws here. The initial "while he was yet speaking" seemingly ties the incident closely to the preceding (11:29); however, in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac, the words are missing. Jesus was invited to a meal by a Pharisee. If the word (Gr. *áriston,* cf. 14:12) is used accurately, it was a luncheon. Ordinarily Jews ate only breakfast and an evening meal except on the Sabbath, but upperclass people, among whom the scribes were reckoned, evidently adopted the Hellenistic-Roman custom of a noonday repast. The Pharisee was surprised that before sitting down to the meal Jesus did not first "bathe" (loosely for washing of hands; cf. Mk. 7:5). Matthew introduces the following as a woe-saying, but Luke has altered it to an ironic reply of "the Lord."

Perhaps consciousness of the social occasion leads Luke to avoid the word "hypocrites," which in Matthew is repeatedly flung at the opponents. Jesus says, "Now (= yea) you Pharisees do cleanse the outside of the cup and the bowl, but inside you are full (Mt. 23:25: they are full) of extortion and wickedness." In v. 41 Luke has: "Did not God who made the outside, also make the inside?" (Codex D and some old Latin texts reverse the order.) "But *give for alms* those things which are within, and behold everything is clean for you." This is highly artificial, and most scholars accept a correction of "give for alms," namely "cleanse," holding that the Greek translator of the saying of Jesus misunderstood the Aramaic word *dakkau,* "cleanse," as *zakkau,* "give alms." This is confirmed by the fact that the parallel in Mt. 23:26 has "first cleanse the inside of the cup and of the plate that the outside also may be clean."

vv. 42–44 The "but" beginning the sentence leads over to a broadening of the situation with a series of three woes. In the first (= Mt. 23:23), Jesus mentions the Pharisaic tithing of mint, *rue* and *every herb* (Mt.: mint, dill and cummin), and neglecting justice and the love of God (in Mt. the concern is with "justice, mercy and faith"). The statement "these you ought to have done, etc." is missing in Codex D and is probably derived from Mt. 23:23. The second woe deals with their presiding in synagogues and their expectation of public salutation (= Mt. 23:6; cf. Mk. 12:39). A third woe (= Mt. 23:27) compares them to tombs—not to whitewashed ones, as in Matthew, but rather to such that are not particularly noticeable and hence not recognized for what they are. (The kind of tomb presupposed is naturally one level with the ground.)

vv. 45–52 With a separate incident, Luke introduces a paragraph on the "lawyers" (Matthew's "scribes," whom he lumped with the Pharisees). One of these, addressing Jesus as "teacher," says that in assailing the Pharisees he is reproaching them also. Jesus answers with a series of three woes directed against this group.

In the first woe (= Mt. 23:4), he asserts that they load men with burdens hard to bear, but do not touch one such burden with their fingers (to help). In the second (= Mt. 23:29–36), he castigates them for building the tombs of the Prophets. The invective is not as convincing as in Matthew; that they *consent* to the deeds of their fathers in building sepulchral monuments to those whom the fathers slew seems artificial. In place of Mt. 23:34, "Therefore I send you prophets and wise men and scribes," Luke has: "Therefore also the Wisdom of God said: I will send the prophets *and apostles.*" This sounds almost like a quotation from a wisdom book, but perhaps the initial words merely mean "God, in his wisdom, said." Matthew's form of the saying seems more natural. The allusion here to the martyrdom of *apostles* (for Luke has *kill* and persecute) made the saying more vivid for Luke's readers. The third woe (= Mt. 23: 13) accuses the lawyers of *taking away the key of knowledge* (i.e., of the knowledge of salvation, 1:77). However, Matthew's locking the doors of the kingdom fits better with their not entering themselves.

v. 53 Luke adds a narrative conclusion to the occasion of the meal. When he had gone forth from there (Codex D and some other texts: "And as he said these things to them before all the people") the scribes (one would expect "lawyers") and Pharisees began to press upon him vehemently and to provoke him (to speak) concerning more things, lying in wait for him to catch something out of his mouth.

12:1 This is really a sequel to the preceding section, though it also serves as introduction to 12:2 f. The sentence speaks of "myriads of the crowd" coming together so that they trod on one another. Jesus first addressed his disciples with the warning to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. Luke thus makes up for his deletion of "hypocrites" in the discourse, and at the same time utilizes the saying that was found in more original form and in a vivid situation in Mk. 8:15—a striking instance of the metamorphosis of material.

12:2–12 Exhortation to Fearless Confession (Mt. 10:26–33; 12:32; 10:19–20), Q.

Luke puts here a sheaf of Q material.

vv. 2–9 (Mt. 10:26–33) The saying that nothing is hid except to be made manifest appeared already in 8:17 (= Mk. 4:22). Since Luke evidently imagines the discourse of 12:1 as continuing, he seems to construe this as referring to a possible concealment of convictions. What they say in the darkness will be heard in the light, what they say into the ear in chambers will be proclaimed on the roofs. (Mt.: What Jesus says in the darkness the disciples are to say in the light, and what they hear in the ear they are to proclaim on the roofs.) The admonition to fearlessness is introduced with "I say to you my friends" (cf. 7:6), to call attention to the fact that this is still especially meant for the disciples. Those who can kill the body —"after these things"—have nothing further that they can do. He will show them whom they should fear: him who after the killing has power to cast into Gehenna. (Mt.: to destroy soul and body in Gehenna.) Luke underlines this with a repetition of the admonition to fear God. In the saying about the sparrows, vv. 6–7 (= Mt. 10:29) the conclusion is toned down to "not one of them is forgotten before God"; that about acknowledging or denying Christ before men in v. 9 (Mt. 10:32–33) is made more solemn with a special introductory "but I say to you," and the acknowledging and denying by Christ is put in the third person: the Son of man will acknowledge (or deny) him before the angels of God (Mt.: before his Father in heaven). Perhaps Mk. 8:38 gives this saying in still more original form.

v. 10 (Mt. 12:32) Luke omitted the saying in the corresponding passage (after 11:23) and fits it in here. He speaks of *blaspheming* against the Holy Spirit (but Codex D does not have that expression). Matthew's "in this world age or the one to come" is missing. It seems probable that the saying was originally concerned with denial of the inspiration claimed by the Apostles, and hence was of ecclesiastical origin.

vv. 11–12 (Mt. 10:19 f.) Luke elaborates on the situations of persecution. Jesus speaks of their being brought before synagogues (assemblies for disciplinary action), secular courts, and (foreign political) authority. They are not to worry about how they should defend themselves, and what they should say: the Holy Spirit will teach them in that hour what is needful to say. (Mt.: they are not speaking, but the Spirit of the Father is the one speaking in them [= through them?]).

It is evident that this whole compilation is imagined as continuing the address to the disciples begun in 12:1.

12:13–21 Parable of the Rich Fool. Luke here presents special material. Jesus is asked by an individual from "the crowd" (12:1) to urge his brother to divide the inheritance with him. (The situation could be that of Deut. 21:15–17 or just a case of delay in settling an estate.) He rejects this with the question: "O man (22:58, 60) who appointed me judge and divider of inheritances (this phrase missing in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac) over you?" (There are judges especially appointed to regulate such matters.) People of distinction and especially of a royal line could, however, readily be appealed to, to act as arbitrators. If Jesus was regarded as of Davidic descent such a request was not unnatural (cf. Ps. 122:5).

v. 15 The incident is the occasion of a warning to the crowd against covetousness. "For not by one's having superabundance is one's (earthly) life assured by his possessions" (Sinaitic Syriac: is life assured for a man).

vv. 16–21 He now spoke to them a parable. A certain rich man's field bore well. He had not enough storage place for his fruits. He decided to tear down his barns and build bigger ones, there to gather all his harvest (some manuscripts: "his grain and his good things"; cf. 1:53). And he would say to his soul (= his inner self): "Soul, [omitted in some manuscripts] you have many good things laid up (sufficient) for many years. Take it easy, eat, drink (and) be merry (familiar language of ancient Oriental and Greek wisdom counsel of the hedonistic type). But God said to him: "Thou fool (cf. Ps. 14:1), in this same night they (impersonal) will ask thy soul of thee. What thou hast prepared, to whom shall it be? (He is not even allowed enough time to make a will!) Thus (= like this) is the one who heaps up treasure for himself and does not gather wealth unto God (= has no treasure stored up in heaven; cf. Mt. 6:19–21). This sentence is, however, missing in Codex D. The parable is a commentary on v. 15. It seemed a good place to put vv. 15–21 because the topic of possessions was suggested in 13–14.

12:22–34 Cares about Earthly Things (Mt. 6:25–33, 19–21), Q. Jesus again turns to the disciples. The words *"Therefore* I say unto you" seek to connect this material with the preceding. The text agrees with Matthew's, except for minor variations. In v. 23 there is no rhetorical question as in Mt. 6:25, but a positive statement: "The life is more than food, etc." Instead of urging man to look at the "birds of heaven," Luke has them "consider the ravens," and says they have neither storehouse nor barn. After the question about adding to one's stature, he has a remark without equivalent in Matthew. "If you are not able to do as small a thing as that why are you anxious about the remaining things?" In the saying about the lilies, he does not have "how they grow," but says "they spin not neither do they weave" (so Codex D and the Old Syriac; in other texts the saying is corrected on the basis of Mt.). They are not to seek what they are to eat or drink, nor to become excited about it. For all the nations of the world seek these things. The difficult saying of Mt. 6:33 appears in more simple form as, "But seek his kingdom and these things shall be added unto you." Mt. 6:34 has no equivalent.

vv. 32–34 The first saying is special material of Luke. It is obviously an exhortation addressed to the Christians. They are still a little flock, but theirs is the kingdom (cf. 6:20), thanks to the pleasure of their Father. In vv. 33 f. we have the equivalent of Mt. 6:19–21, but with considerable variation. In place of a warning against laying up treasures there is an exhortation to sell one's possessions and give alms. They are to make (= provide) for themselves (leather) purses which will not grow old (and rotten), (accumulating in them) an inexhaustible treasure in the heavens. Luke steers back into the more mundane with "where no thief draws near and no moth destroys," which fitted better in Matthew's version.

12:35–46 Watchfulness and Faithfulness (Mt. 24:43–51), Q

vv. 35–38 These verses are special material of Luke. There is no introductory phrase setting it off as separate, and so the discourse of Jesus that began in 12:22 is imagined as continuing. Their loins are to be girded, i.e., the long garment is to be "hitched up" with a sash or girdle, in readiness to march. Their lamps are to burn (Mt. 25:1–13), and they shall be like servants awaiting the return of their Lord. (Here Luke's material parallels Mk. 13:34 ff.) A blessing is pronounced over those servants whom the Lord returning from the marriage feast finds watching. An Amen-saying (rare in Luke) is added, foretelling how the Lord will wait on them and serve them (cf. Jn. 13:5 ff.). If he comes in the second or third watch (9–12 P.M. and 12–3 A.M.) and finds it thus (i.e., finds them still watching), blessed are they.

vv. 39–40 (Mt. 24:43–44) In this saying on the thief in the night, Luke varies only slightly from Matthew. The householder would not have left the house (Mt.: would have watched) had he known when the thief would come.

vv. 41–46 (Mt. 24:45–51) Luke provides a special introductory question by Peter: whether the preceding "parable" (vv. 39–40, with the idea that the disciples could be surprised by the Second Coming) applies to them or to all? (The last words are missing in Codex D.) The Q material of vv. 42 ff. is introduced with "the Lord said." The variations from Matthew are slight. In the case of the kind of steward-slave whom Matthew calls "bad" he not only beats the menservants as in Matthew but the maidservants too. He does not, as in Matthew, carry on convivially, but merely drinks (alone?) and becomes intoxicated. The returning master "divides him" (see on Mt. 25:41) and sets for him his portion with the unbelievers (Mt.: hypocrites). The interesting reading of the Sinaitic Syriac was likewise mentioned in the comments on Matthew. The latter's allusion to the wailing and gnashing of teeth is not found here.

12:47–48 The Servant's Reward. Luke here has special material. The slave who knew what his Lord wanted, but failed to prepare anything or carry out his wishes will be struck many (blows). The one who did not know what his Lord wanted and did what is deserving of blows will receive few. The moral drawn in v. 48 is that of him to whom much is given much will be sought and of him to whom much is entrusted more will be demanded. As this has the form of parallelism, so common in poetry, the difference (gift and trust) is probably not to be pressed. In adducing this material, Luke still is thinking of it as addressed to the disciples (12: 22, 41).

12:49–56 Seriousness of the Times (Mt. 10:34–36; 16:2–3), Q

vv. 49–50 Some special material of Luke precedes that which he has in common with Matthew. It consists of two sayings which originally may have been separate. In the first (v. 49) Jesus is come to cast fire upon earth, and wishes it were already kindled—possibly an allusion to the swift spread of the movement initiated by him. (If one takes the fire as figurative for dissension then a continuity with what follows in vv. 51 ff. can be attained; but this seems artificial, for Jesus could hardly desire that dissension.) In the second saying he must (first) be baptized with a baptism (= death, cf. Mk. 10:38), and how pressed he is (with fear, cf. the same word 8:37) until it is completed! He does not say that his death is the necessary presupposition for the spread of his movement. The saying has no connection with what follows.

vv. 50–53 (Mt. 10:34–36) Luke begins in question form. Do they think Jesus has come to bring peace on earth? In place of Matthew's bringing "a sword" Luke speaks of "division." The description of the division is more detailed than in Matthew; he thinks of a household of five composed of father, mother, a son and his wife, and an unmarried daughter; there will be three against two or two against three. The passage is reminiscent of Micah 7:6, which presumably was regarded as a prophecy of the dissension that Christian missionary activity brought into families. The remark in Mt. 10:36 is missing.

vv. 54–56 This is special material of Luke. (The parallel found in some mss. in Mt. 16:2–3, though not original, there, is helpful here, as another textual witness.) Jesus addresses the crowds and alludes to their being weather-wise (the clouds from the west spell rain, the south wind indicates hot weather—both true for Palestine). Calling them "hypocrites" (missing in Mt.), he says that they know how to examine the face of the earth and of heaven (the earth is an irrelevant addition; it is missing in Mt.), but why do they not know how to examine this (present) time (Mt.: "the signs of the times")?

12:57–59 Coming to Terms with One's Adversary (Mt. 5:25–26). "And why do you not of yourselves judge what is right" cannot well belong to the preceding owing to the Greek particles used, but it is not really germane to what follows. It is evidently an isolated saying. Vv. 58–59 are the counterpart of Mt. 5:25–26. When one goes to the "ruler" with one's adversary, one should "do work" (a Latinism) to get free from him (so that he drops the prosecution), lest he drag one to the judge, and the judge hand one over to the officer (Gr. *práktōr,* the one who executes what the judge decrees; Mt.: "the servant") and the officer put one in prison. One then will have to pay the last penny (Gr. *leptón;* Mt.: *kodrántēs,* Roman *quadrans,* worth two *lepta*). It is doubtful whether this was just practical-wisdom counsel. More probably it was meant eschatologically: through repentance arrive at an accommodation with God before the judgment!

13:1–9 The Call to Repentance; Parable of the Fig Tree. This is further special material of Luke. Some persons bring Jesus the news about the Galileans "whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices." This seemingly implies that the men were slain in the Temple. But such an incident would certainly have been mentioned by Josephus. Pilate slew Samaritans at Mt. Gerizim (Jos., *Ant., 18,* 4, 1), but this did not take place until A.D. 35, after the time of Jesus. According to Luke, Jesus asks the bearers of the news whether these Galileans had become debtors (to God for nonfulfillment of obligations) beyond all (other) Galileans, that they have suffered these things? He answers the question himself, turning it immediately into ethical application: "No, but if his hearers do not repent they will perish in like manner (in the judgment)." He then asks the same question and gives the same reply in commenting on the fall of the Tower of Siloam, at which occasion eighteen people were killed. That this is not mentioned by Josephus is not surprising, since it was a mere accident. The tower must have been one in the city's walls, which were largely dismantled in Jesus' time; no doubt it got its name from its proximity to the Pool of Siloam, in the southern part of the Tyropoeon Valley. Jesus was not troubled by the theodicy problem, which our notion of equality makes a pressing one. These happenings are viewed simply as divine warnings.

vv. 6–9 The same theme is continued in the parable of the vineyard owner, who orders his vine dresser to (Codex D adds: fetch the ax and) cut down a fig tree which had not borne for the last three years, and was simply using up the soil. A fig tree is still a common sight in a Palestinian vineyard. It provides a bit of welcome shade in the heat of the day; no wonder the workman pleads that it be spared for yet another year. He offers to dig around it and give it (Codex D adds: a basket of) manure; perhaps it will bear next year, but if not then, cut it down! A vivid prophetic parable: this now is the final respite; if repentance does not result, then the judgment will follow (cf. 3:9).

13:10–17 Healing of the Bent Woman. This is another piece of special material. In the source from which Luke drew it, it evidently performed the same function as the healing of the man with the withered hand (6:6–11). Jesus was teaching on the Sabbath in "one of the synagogues." A woman was present who had had a "spirit of infirmity (sickness)" for eighteen years. She was bent over, unable to straighten herself up. Seeing her, Jesus called her to him and said to her that she had been freed of her illness. He put his hands on her, and immediately she was straightened and praised God. (Nothing is said of casting out the spirit mentioned in v. 11; this element has been replaced by the laying on of hands.) The ruler of the synagogue, displeased at a seeming violation of the Sabbath, spoke up and said to the crowd that they should seek healing on one of the six weekdays, not on the Sabbath. (He avoids direct criticism of the healer.) Addressing all of those of this mind as "hypocrites," Jesus asked: "Does not each one of you on the Sabbath (have to) loose his ox or ass from the crib and lead it off to water it (variant of 14:5–6 = Mt. 12:11–12?)? But this woman, though a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan (cf. the "spirit" of v. 11) bound these eighteen years, is not to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath?" When he said this, all his adversaries were put to shame, and the crowd rejoiced at the many glorious deeds that were (constantly) coming about through him.

13:18–21 Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven (Mt. 13:31–33, Q; cf. Mk. 4:30–32). Luke links this to the preceding with "he said therefore." Apparently the joy of the crowd awakens hope for the growth of the kingdom. Matthew has these same parables, but Mark has only the first. Luke, however, like Mark, uses the question form in the introduction: to what is the kingdom of God like? Mark speaks of one's sowing the mustard seed on the ground; Matthew, of a man's sowing it in his field; Luke, of a man's casting it in his garden. Luke omits the remark about its being the smallest seed and becoming the largest shrub. The parable of the leaven has only slight, formal variations from Matthew—the interrogative introduction, and the usual "kingdom of God" instead of "kingdom of heaven."

13:22–30 Israel Threatened with Exclusion from the Kingdom (Mt. 7:13–14; 25:10–12; 7:22–23; 8:11–12), Q

vv. 22–23 Luke editorially brings in the travel theme and describes Jesus as going on to Jerusalem, teaching in towns and villages along the way. Without special localization, he introduces a question from one in an audience: "Lord, are those who will be saved few?" One might expect this to have negative form: Are *not* those who will be saved few? (How then can you speak of the growth of the kingdom, as you have done in 13:18–21? Cf.

18:26.) But there is no real connection with the preceding material. Luke has apparently just raised the question editorially in order to introduce the sayings that follow.

v. 24 (Mt. 7:13–14) Luke here gives the saying of the narrow gate, but in shorter form, omitting reference to the wide gate. He speaks of "struggling" to enter "the narrow gate" and says that many will seek to enter, but will not be able to do so.

vv. 25–27 This is special material, placed here perhaps only because the key word "door" occurs in it. It puts in predictive form what Matthew's parable of the ten virgins has in narrative form (cf. Mt. 25:10–12). To the "I do not know you" there is added "whence are you?" The thought of further appeal (not used in the parable) leads to extension of this, in the manner of Mt. 7:22–23. They will begin to say, "We ate before thee, and drank, and in our streets thou didst teach" (cf. 10:10). But Jesus will say to them, "I do not know you, whence you are," and bids them depart from him, "all (you) workers of iniquity" (Ps. 6:8). The Greek quotation is not as close to the LXX as in Mt. 7:23.

vv. 28–30 (Mt. 8:11–12) There will be wailing and gnashing of teeth (put at the end in Mt.) when they see the patriarchs and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, with themselves cast out (cf. 16: 23 ff.). Without Matthew's "I say to you," he gives the prediction about those coming from east and west (adding: from north and south; cf. Is. 49:12, Ps. 107:3) and reclining at the banquet in the kingdom of God. (Having brought in the allusion to the patriarchs in v. 28, he omits it here, together with the prediction about the sons of the kingdom going forth into outer darkness, Mt. 8:12.) But Luke adds the saying about the last and the first (Mk. 10:31; Mt. 19:30; 20:16), giving it a different slant, for he is thinking of the Gentiles who will be first, while the Jews will be last (in fact excluded).

13:31–33 Departure from Galilee. This is special material of Luke. In 9:51 f. Jesus was already bound for Jerusalem. Rather inconsistently this piece imagines him as in Herod's territory. The Pharisees may have been introduced into the text secondarily; they are hardly the proper warners, in view of Mk. 3:6. That Herod intended to kill Jesus is an interesting report, and may be considered reliable; it helps to account for Jesus' trip to Phoenicia, Mk. 7:24 ff., for which no explanation is given by Mark. Jesus tells his informants to say to "this fox" (symbol of craftiness, also in rabbinic texts) that he is driving out demons and performing healings "today and tomorrow" [and that on the third day he will be made "perfect," i.e., die and be elevated to heaven; cf. Heb. 11:40; 12: 23]. But [today and tomorrow and] on the following day he must go on (toward the Holy City), for it is impossible that a prophet perish outside Jerusalem—an ironical remark, implying that Jerusalem has had a virtual monopoly in killing prophets! If the bracketed words are eliminated, the saying gains in clarity. Perhaps some Christian interpolator wanted to bring in a hint of the resurrection on the third day; this necessitated a repetition of "today and tomorrow" in the next sentence. The original point was simply: you can do nothing to me, so I am not going to flee. My fate is to die at Jerusalem after continuing my activity for a day or two (figurative for a short time).

13:34–35 Prophecy over Jerusalem (Mt. 23:37–39), Q. This saying has apparently been put here partly because of the key word "Jerusalem" in the preceding piece. It makes an effective conclusion, but actually, fits much better in the Jerusalem situation, where Matthew has it. In comparison with the prediction as given by Matthew, "You will not see me from now on until you say: 'Blessed be he that cometh,' " Luke omits "from now on" and substitutes "until it (the time) comes when you say." He omits the word "desolate" in speaking of their house (figurative for Jerusalem) being forsaken. New life had begun at the city when Luke wrote (cf. on 24:13–35).

14:1–6 The Healing of the Man with the Dropsy. This is another piece of Luke's special material. It is devoted to the same theme as 6:6–11; 13:10–17. On a Sabbath, Jesus went to the house of one of the leading men of the Pharisees to "eat bread," and they (the Pharisees) were lying in wait for him. A sufferer from dropsy came into the room at this occasion (uninvited persons evidently could stray in; cf. Mt. 22:11). Jesus asked the "lawyers" and Pharisees whether it was permissible or not to heal on the Sabbath. But they remained silent (cf. Mk. 3:4). Jesus took hold of the afflicted man, healed him, and dismissed him. He then asked the Pharisees: who of them would not pull out his son or his ox (originally the son of his ox? Codex S: ass; Codex D: sheep) out of a well on the Sabbath (cf. 13:15–16; cf. Mt. 12:11)? They were unable to answer. Apparently this incident is imagined by Luke as occurring before the meal. (In the Damascus Document, *13,* 23 f. a man is forbidden to assist a beast giving birth on a Sabbath, and if she lets her young fall into a cistern or ditch he is not to raise it on the Sabbath. A human being is not to be helped out of such a situation by ladder, rope or instrument.)

14:7–14 Discourses at Table

vv. 7–11 The special material is continued in this section. When Jesus saw how the invited guests were selecting the first places (places at the heads of the small groups, into which the company was split up; cf. Mt. 23:6), he spoke a "parable" (here only an extended comparison unless, perchance, Luke has derived the thought from an actual parable). If one is invited to a marriage feast, he is advised by Jesus not to occupy a place at the head lest the host direct him to give the place to one of more distinction, thus putting him into a shameful position when he moves to the last place; let him rather drop down (in order to recline) at the last place, and then be requested by the host to move up. For in this way he will be honored in the presence of all his fellow diners. The proverbial saying: "He who exalts himself will be humbled" (cf. 18:14, Mt. 23:12), caps this comparison. The humbling meant is that of the judgment. Taken as wisdom counsel, it would have to be regarded as ironical, since it would imply a calculated way of obtaining honor that Jesus could scarcely have endorsed. That the thirst for recognition was characteristic of the Pharisees is shown by Mt. 23:6, and is substantiated by rabbinic sources.

vv. 12–14 Luke also puts here a Saying addressed to the host. Jesus counsels that in "making a luncheon (11:38) or a dinner" one should not invite guests who would reciprocate (so that one is paid off for his "good works"), but rather the unfortunates. He speaks a Beatitude over the one who acts thus, for since such guests cannot reciprocate, the host will be repaid in "the resurrection of the just." (This phrase seemingly implies only a partial resurrection; cf. 20:36, where the righteous are called "sons of the resurrection." It was a Pharisaic belief according to Jos., *Ant., 18,* 1, 3. Contrast Jn. 5:28.)

14:15–24 Parable of the Great Supper (Mt. 22:1–10), Q.

Luke connects the parable with the situation of 14:1 by introducing an exclamation of a fellow guest: "Blessed is he who eats bread in the kingdom of God!" This was scarcely taken from any source, but is just a literary device of the author. It established a transition to the theme of the heavenly banquet at which God is the host. In Luke's version of the parable, the banquet is a dinner, not a marriage feast of the king's son as in Matthew, and the householder has only one servant (slave) who typifies Christ. In conveying the message to the previously invited guests that the meal is now ready, the servant does not elaborate on the viands. But Luke goes into more detail on how the guests received the notice. One says to him (probably meaning to the host through instrumentality of the servant) that he has bought a field (= a farm?) and must go out to see it, another has bought five yoke of oxen. These two beg to be excused. The third has just got married, which evidently is excuse enough. Since there is no king in this parable, there is no room for allusion to destruction of the city in which the guests lived, as in Matthew. The householder is angry, however, and sends the servant out to the streets and alleys to invite the poor, the cripples, the blind, and lame (Mt.: to the crossways to invite whom they might find). Luke does not have the bringing in of both bad and good wherewith Matthew prepares the way for Mt. 22:11–14; instead, he extends the parable with the thought that there was still room in the banquet hall. The servant is sent forth a second time to the (country-) roads and (vineyard-) hedges to urge people to come so that his master's house may be filled. This evidently hints at the missionary work among the Gentiles and represents a secondary extension of the parable. The original ending, however, which is lost in Matthew, is given in v. 24: none of the guests first invited shall taste his banquet.

14:25–35 Conditions of Discipleship (Mt. 10:37–38), Q

vv. 25–27 The impression of further travel on the way to Jerusalem is renewed; a great multitude accompanies Jesus. Perhaps with a thought of discouraging them, Jesus turns and speaks to them of the resolution required of his followers. Again this seems to be a narrative cleat wherewith to introduce teaching. The first saying is Q material, but appears here in more radical form than in Matthew; the latter speaks of loving one's kin more than Christ. Luke has that whoever does not come to him hating (used in relative sense, as in the case of the less loved of two wives; cf. Deut. 21:15 and Gen. 29:30; Mt. 6:24 interprets correctly) parents, children, brothers and sisters, cannot be his disciple. The saying about the cross was already found in 9:23, though in variant form (= Mk. 8:34; Mt. 16:24). Luke has "bearing the cross" (Mt.: taking it), and "cannot be my disciple" (Mt.: is not worthy of me).

vv. 28–32 Luke here has special material. Two vivid illustrations put in the form of questions are introduced with a view to urging the individual to examine himself as to his capacity to follow Jesus. Who builds a tower (farm building?) without first counting the cost, lest when he has laid the foundation he be unable to finish it, and so exposes himself to ridicule? What king goes forth to (defensive) war with another without first sitting down and taking counsel, whether with his ten thousand he can oppose the one coming against him with twenty thousand? If not, then while the other is still distant, he will send an embassy (i.e., ambassadors) to ask the things (leading) to peace, i.e., his conditions. In thus using these sayings, Luke has given them a deeper meaning than they had originally.

v. 33 This saying completes the thought of vv. 26–27. No one who does not renounce all that is his very own can be his disciple.

vv. 34–35 (Mt. 5:13, Q; cf. Mk. 9:50) The saying on salt does not receive the direct application it has in Matthew. Salt is declared good, but how can its flavor be restored if it become tasteless (cf. on Mk.)? But for Luke, too, the salt means the disciples. They are fit to follow Jesus only if they have the above-mentioned resoluteness. An exhortation to hear (and absorb) the teachings concludes the passage (cf. 8:8).

15:1–10 Parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Piece of Silver (Mt. 18:12–14), Q

vv. 1–2 Luke has a narrative introduction relating how "all the publicans and the sinners" drew near to hear Jesus, and how the Pharisees and scribes murmured against him on this account. This is but a variant of 5:30. What appeared as a question (why do you eat with, etc.?) is here put into a general statement. "This one receives the sinners and eats with them" (there was no reference to eating in v. 1). Luke's purpose is only to provide an occasion for the two short parables.

vv. 3–7 Luke, unlike Matthew, has an introduction announcing a parable and begins this one as well as the following one with a question. What man who has lost one of his hundred sheep does not leave the ninety-nine "in the wilderness" (Mt.: "on the mountains") to search for the lost one? The recovery of the lost sheep is much more vividly related here than in Matthew, and the application which Matthew adds in v. 14 (loss of a "little one") is not found here. Luke's point, instead, is that there is more joy in heaven (i.e., with the angels of God, v. 10) over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous who do not need repentance.

vv. 8–10 The second parable is not found in Matthew's parallel version (cf. the similar instance in 9:61–62). What woman with ten drachmas (ordinarily the Latin denarius is used rather than the

Greek drachma) who loses one of them, does not light a lamp and sweep the house until she finds it, and on finding it calls together friends and neighbors to rejoice over its recovery? (Little, windowless houses and conditions of poverty are presupposed.) This again illustrates "the joy before the angels of God" over the repentant sinner. Vv. 3–10 are vivid examples of sayings reflecting the Palestinian environment of Jesus.

15:11–32 Parable of the Prodigal Son. This is the second of the four great parables preserved only by Luke (cf. on 10:30–37). It is introduced with a simple "but he said." One must assume that it is a further illustration of the previous theme—the rejoicing over the recovery of the lost. The story is more elaborate than in most parables. It is a small novella. A younger son, instead of awaiting the father's death and testamentary dispositions, asked for the portion of the possessions coming to him (one third according to Deut. 21:17). (While it is then said that the father divided "the life" [Gr. *bíos,* here = the property] between them, he evidently retained control of the elder son's share, v. 29. According to Jewish law, the father could have retained the income of the younger son's share as well; it shows his great love that he relinquished it completely.) Soon the younger son, gathering together all things (both money and objects), went to a far country (where he would be able to do what he liked without being admonished), and there squandered his substance, living in debauchery. When he had wasted everything a severe famine came over that country, and he began to suffer want. He attached himself to one of the inhabitants (for the unprotected alien had no rights in antiquity), who sent him out into his fields as (hired) swineherd. Since swine were unclean to Jews (Lev. 11:7), this represents the nadir of abasement. He wished he could fill his belly with such fodder as was fed to his employer's hogs—"the little horns" (horn-shaped fruits of a dark evergreen tree; the Arabs still call these insipid, sweetish fruits "horns" of the carob or *kharrūb* tree), but no one gave him any food. (His pay was evidently too meager to buy enough at famine prices.) In this situation he "came to himself" (a Greek idiomatic phrase). He recalled how many hired men his father had, who enjoyed bread in abundance, while he here was perishing of hunger. He determined to return to his father, to humble himself, and to ask for employment as laborer.

The scene changes: the father is looking out over the country and the road leading to the village. He sees and recognizes the wayward son at a distance and casting aside all dignity runs to meet him, falls on his neck and kisses him. The prodigal confesses that he has sinned "against heaven (= God) and before him," and is not worthy to be called his son. Before he can finish his prepared speech (cf. v. 19) the father interrupts, bidding his servants (several must be imagined as following him, when he ran forth) to bring the "first" (i.e., ceremonial) garment, and a ring and sandals (which items distinguished the free man from the minion), and to put them on him. He also commands slaughter of the fatted calf (held in reserve for contingencies) for a joyous feast—and he states the reason in wondrous words.

The parable might have ended here. But Jesus is telling it to the scribes and Pharisees and therefore gives it an extension that will apply to them. The elder son, returning from the field, hears the sound of music and dancing. A servant whom he summons enlightens him as to the meaning of this. He is angry and does not want to enter the house. His father then comes out and urges him. He replies that he has served his father all these years without transgressing his commandment, yet never has he been given as much as a kid to celebrate a feast with his friends. But when "this *his son,*" who devoured the father's substance with harlots, came, the father has killed the fatted calf for him! The father replies gently, calling him "child." He is always with him (is this not a privilege?), everything he has is his (he therefore can take a kid or fatted calf and can celebrate whenever he wishes); but it was proper to be of good cheer and rejoice at the return of "this *his brother,*" who was as good as dead and lost.

The wayward brother symbolizes the publicans and sinners, while the elder brother represents the righteous in their attitude of disdain for the former. Jesus' (and God's) attitude is that of the father of the parable. What was called the joy in heaven over the repentant sinner in v. 7 and v. 10 is here illustrated anew in one of the most moving stories ever told.

16:1–13 Parable of the Unjust Steward

vv. 1–8 This parable, which is special material of Luke, is introduced as spoken to the *disciples*. A certain rich man had a steward (Gr. *oikonómos*) who was charged with wasting his goods. Notified of the termination of his job and ordered to give his accounting, the steward weighs what is the best thing to do. He is not strong enough to dig (a Greek proverbial expression) and is ashamed to beg. He decides to use the time during which he still has authority, to cut the debts of his master's debtors, on the principle that these would return the favor and show him hospitality when he was out of employment. (For example), the one owing one hundred *bath* (a bath being about nine gallons) of oil had his debt cut 50 per cent; the one owing one hundred *kor* (a kor = ten ephahs, or about ten bushels) of wheat had his debt cut 20 per cent. The story apparently ends here, for the sentence "The Lord praised the steward of unrighteousness (= unrighteous steward) because he had acted wisely" can hardly have the certain rich man for its subject. It is a report by the original traditioner. "The Lord" is Jesus, as in 18:6. His (ironic) praise of the steward is not quoted. Only his further comment is given: "The sons of this world age (to whom the steward belonged) are wiser unto their generation (i.e., among their own kind) than the sons of light" (a phrase now evidenced for Palestine by the Dead Sea Scrolls; cf. also Jn. 12:36; 1 Thess. 5:5; Eph. 5:8) among theirs. The application is given in v. 9; Jesus impresses on his hearers that what they should do is this: Make friends (among the angels) by means of "the mammon (for this word cf. on Mt. 6:24) of unrighteousness"—a stock phrase like our "filthy lucre"—in order that when it departs (i.e., at death or at the judgment; cf. the treasure that does not depart, 12:33) they (the angels) may receive them into the everlasting tents (Ps. 118:15, in which the righteous will dwell in the afterlife). For Jesus, mammon was unrighteous and to give it away for charity was the right thing to do. Thus only did one gain a treasure in heaven (Mk. 10:21) or friends in that quarter (a different illustration of the same idea).

vv. 10–12 The parable was a bit troublesome for those who did not appreciate its irony, and so Luke adds other sayings lest anyone think Jesus was approving the steward's unscrupulousness: (1) He who is faithful in a very little is faithful in much; he who is unjust (= unfaithful) in little is unjust in much. This saying is reported in variant forms in second-century sources. (2) If you have not been faithful with unrighteous mammon, who will entrust you with the true thing (the spiritual gifts)? (3) If you were not faithful with another's (possessions), who will give you your own (i.e., the inheritance in heaven)?

v. 13 (Mt. 6:24, Q) This is added as a fourth saying, perhaps simply because it contained the key word "mammon." In fitting it into this connection, Luke says: "no *house-slave* (Gr. *oikétēs*) can serve two masters."

16:14–15 Condemnation of the Conceit of the Pharisees. Luke fits in here another small piece of special material. The Pharisees heard the preceding teachings and scoffed at Jesus. They are characterized as "money-loving." In his references to the "mammon of unrighteousness," Jesus had by implication condemned love of money. However, the saying of Jesus replying to the scoffing is not specifically pointed at love of money, and so the introductory remark about this seems to be purely transitional, to bring in v. 15. Jesus accuses them of being "justifiers of self" before men, and warns that God knows their hearts (cf. 1 Sam. 16:7: and disapproves of their conceit), for what is lofty among men is an abomination before God (cf. Is. 2:11).

16:16–18 About the Law and about Divorce (Mt. 11:12–13; 5:18, 31–32), Q. Three sayings, not necessarily spoken at one occasion or connected with each other, have been put here. An artificial connection with 16:14–15 can be made by supplying the thought that the Pharisees harp on the law of Moses.

v. 16 (Mt. 11:12–13) Over against this, Jesus teaches that the era of the law and the prophets ended with John; from then on the kingdom is preached, and everyone presses into it. (Instead of the kingdom's being present already, as in Mt., it is being preached.)

v. 17 (Mt. 5:18) Luke has this saying in even stronger form than Matthew does. It is *easier* for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fall. The saying was apparently put here to counteract any inference from v. 16 that Jesus considered the law abrogated.

v. 18 (Mt. 5:31–32) Luke's purpose here seems to be to give an example of Jesus' insistence on the law. His putting aside of Deut. 24:1 was not a departure from the true will of God (cf. Mk. 10:5 f., Mt. 19:9). The remarrying divorcer commits adultery (Mt.: the divorcer makes the remarrying wife an adulteress), likewise the man marrying a divorcee (in neither case is guilt attributed to the woman).

16:19–31 The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. This third of the four great parables (cf. Lk. 10:30 f.; 15:11 f.) also is Luke's special material. There is no indication of who is being addressed. The concern is still with "mammon" (16:9, etc.). The parable is a story with popular appeal, contrasting the rich man and the poor man in their lot here and hereafter.

The rich man clothed himself with "purple" (as outergarment) and "byssus" or fine linen (as undergarment; in reversed order, Prov. 31:22). He was luxuriously merry daily (9:23). An (apparently lame or helpless) poor man, significantly named Lazarus (= Heb. Eleazar, "God helps") was (daily) put down (by his relatives?) at the gate (of the forecourt; cf. Mk. 14:68) of the rich man's house (to beg alms of those going in and out). He was covered with festering sores (leprosy? cf. Job 2:7) and was desirous of being fed from the things falling from the table of the rich man (i.e., the bread used by the guests to wipe their fingers). Dogs—the despised scavengers in the Near East, not man's best friend—came and licked his sores, the nadir of his abasement. But when he died, he (i.e., his soul) was borne by the angels to Abraham's bosom. (In rabbinic texts, too, we hear of angels carrying the righteous dead away to Paradise.

Being carried "to Abraham's bosom" means to the place of honor, where he can recline next to Abraham at the heavenly banquet; cf. Mt. 8:11 and Jn. 13:23. His burial is not even mentioned. But the rich man died and was buried (had a real funeral). The parable omits any account of how his soul was borne off. (In rabbinic texts, the souls of the unrighteous are carried to Sheol by the "angels of destruction.") In Hades (= Gehenna in this one instance), being in pain, he lifts up his eyes and sees Abraham from afar and Lazarus in his bosom. He calls out loudly to father Abraham to have mercy on him, and to let Lazarus dip the tip of his finger in water and come touch his tongue, to help assuage his pain. Abraham speaks kindly: "Child (for the rich man, too, is his descendant), remember that thou didst receive thy good things in thy life (no mention of any evil deeds!); Lazarus, in like manner, the bad. Now he is being comforted and thou art being tortured. On top of all those things (there is this obstacle): between us and you (plural) there is firmly fixed a great chasm, so that crossing is impossible." (Cf. the apocryphal Second Book of Esdras 7:36: "And the lake of torment will appear and over against it will be a place of rest; the furnace of the pit will appear, and over against it the paradise of joy.")

The rich man helplessly resigns himself to his own fate, but he asks Father Abraham to send Lazarus to his "father's house" to bear witness to his five brothers that they may not come into this place of torture. (The witness to be borne is that there is an equalization in the afterlife. In effect this is to warn them.) Abraham says, "They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them (when they are read in the synagogue)." But the rich man, knowing that his brothers will pay no more attention to Law and Prophets than he himself did, says, "Not so, Father Abraham, but if one of the dead came to them they would repent." But Abraham is adamant: "If they do not hear Moses and the Prophets they will not believe if someone would rise from the dead (and come to them)." Some think that this was formulated with an eye to the resurrection of Lazarus (Jn. 11:44), which had no effect on the Jews, and that the poor man's name was also chosen because of that story. However, the allusion could well be to Jesus' resurrection, and involve a disparagement of its power to persuade.

The idea of the afterlife presupposed in the story is contrary to the usual view found in the New Testament. Instead of an intermediate state until the resurrection of the dead and final Judgment, an immediate settlement of man's final destiny at death is envisioned. A similar presupposition is found in the saying of the crucified Jesus to the malefactor (23:43). Paradise and Gehenna are entered directly after death, according to the parable. This difference from the more usual view may be due to the traditional nature of the material. Jesus used it, we must suppose, as a vehicle for the immediate purpose in hand, not to present teachings on eschatology. It illustrates the first Beatitude of 6:20: "Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God." Nothing ever written on the theme of rich and poor has stirred the consciences of men as much as this parable.

17:1–2 On Offenses (Mt. 18:6–7, Q; cf. Mk. 9:42). Luke introduces this saying as addressed to the disciples. The statement about the inevitability of the coming of offenses (Gr. *skándala*), and the woe over the one causing them is put first instead of last (as in Mt.). It would be more useful to such a one to be drowned than to give offense to "one of these little ones" (not interpreted as in Mt.).

17:3–4 On Being Conciliatory (Mt. 18: 15, 21–22), Q. With an admonition to take heed, Luke brings in the saying on forgiveness, but in shorter form than Matthew. One is to warn his sinning brother and forgive him if he repents. Luke joins with this saying another that in Matthew is given with a particular incident for its background. Instead of forgiving one's brother seventy times seven, Luke has that one should forgive him seven times a day. But the introduction of repentance as presupposition of forgiveness marks an important difference.

17:5–6 On Faith (Mt. 17:20; cf. 21:21; Mk. 11:22–23). Luke introduces a request of the "Apostles" to "the Lord" to give them more faith—perhaps with an eye to being able to work miracles; cf. Mt. 17:19 f. (In Mt., Jesus volunteers the saying on account of their "littleness of faith," while in Mark, Jesus urged faith before making a similar statement.) Jesus approves of the request. If they had only a small amount of faith, they could say to this sycamine tree, "Be rooted up and be planted in the sea." Since Luke has omitted the story of the fig tree (Gr. *sykê*), with which another version of the saying is associated in Mt. 21:18–22, the (related) sycamine tree may have suggested itself to him as a substitute for moving mountains, which seemed too cataclysmic. Possibly this piece was put here because of the key word "sea" (cf. 17:2).

17:7–10 The Reward of the Servant. A piece of Luke's special material. The connection (cf. v. 5) suggests that it is addressed to the disciples, but since these hardly had the possessions enumerated, that is not to be relied on. The original audience may have been wealthy farmers. It is a parable in question form: Who of you, having a slave that (during the day) has plowed, or pastured sheep, will invite him to come and sit down at (a prepared) table? The master will, instead, tell the slave to prepare (food) that he, the master, may eat, and then to gird himself (12:37) and wait on him. Only afterward can the slave eat. Nor does the master thank the slave for doing what he was commanded to do. (You are in the same relation to God as the slave is to the master; God has given you commands.) So when you have done what you were told to do, say (= think): We are useless servants (an expression of self-depreciation by the abject slaves). The barb of the parable thus seems to be directed against those who look for a reward for their good works —an attitude typical of Pharisaism.

17:11–19 The Healing of Ten Lepers. This is another piece of Luke's special material, though partly related to Mk. 1:40–45. It is allegedly an incident from the final Jerusalem journey, but is localized as occurring when Jesus was passing "between Samaria and Galilee," i.e., along the border of the two districts in the plain of Esdrelon, where a Samaritan man and Galileans might well mingle. (The geographical progression is lost sight of, for in 9:51 ff. Jesus was already going through Samaria. Perhaps the introductory sentence belonged to the anecdote as received by Luke.) Ten lepers standing afar (not daring to come close to the road) cried out, "Jesus, master, have mercy on us." Seeing them, Jesus said to them that they should go show themselves to the priests (in order to be declared cured of their illness; cf. on Mk. 1:44). As they departed, their leprosy quickly cleared up. One of the ten—the Samaritan—before proceeding further to show himself to his priest and bring his sacrifice on Mt. Gerizim—came back, praising God, and fell down on his face at the feet of Jesus and thanked him. This gave Jesus the occasion to ask (rhetorically) where the other nine were, and whether none were found to turn back and give glory to God except this man of non-Jewish stock. He then told the Samaritan to arise and go; his faith (demonstrated in his obedience to Jesus' directive of v. 14a) had saved him (= delivered him from his disease; cf. 7:50, 8:48 and Mk. 5:34).

17:20–21 Concerning the Kingdom of God. This passage is from Luke's special material. Jesus is asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God is coming (the assumption being that its coming must be discernible by certain signs). Jesus replies that it does not come with observation (Gr. *paratērēsis,* of the heavenly signs; so used by secular Greek writers), nor will they (be able to) say, "It is here or there" (cf. Mk. 13:21). The final statement is variously interpreted. It is most naturally rendered "the kingdom of God is within you." If that is what the words mean, then this must be a way of saying that they will intuitively know when the kingdom arrives. But it is also possible to translate "the kingdom of God is in the midst of you (already)." In 11:20 a similar incipient presence of it is assumed. However, the words could also be taken in the sense "the kingdom of God is (= will be) in the midst of you (unexpectedly)"; it is useless to ask when or where it will appear. It seems likely that Luke in taking over this material interpreted it in the light of his general position that salvation was present in Jesus. Having stressed the importance of the period when Jesus was present on earth, he can go on with surprising objectivity to introduce apocalyptic materials in vv. 22 f. It does not matter when those now more or less remote developments will occur.

17:22–37 The Days of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:26–27, 37–41; 10:39; 24:40–41; 24:28)

vv. 22–24 This is addressed to the disciples. Rabbinic texts frequently refer to the Messianic Age as "the days of the Messiah." In the Gospels the Messiah has been largely metamorphosed into the apocalyptic Son of man; hence Jesus predicts that the disciples will desire to see *one* of the days of the Son of man (the one of v. 30), but in vain. The rest of this parallels Mt. 24:26–28, but is shorter; reports of the renewed presence of Christ not only are to be disbelieved, but are not to be followed up (cf. Mt. 24:23); the idea that the lightning goes forth from east to west is revised to "from under the heaven to under the heaven" (i.e., from one side to the other); instead of Matthew's "there will be the parousia of the Son of man" he has "thus will the Son of man be in his day," for Luke avoids the word *parousia.* The saying about the eagles (Mt. 24:28) is put later in v. 37.

v. 25 Luke here has a saying not found in Matthew's parallel passage: the Son of man must first suffer and be rejected by this generation.

vv. 26–30 Old Testament examples are then adduced to show how unexpected will be what will happen in the days of the Son of man (so v. 24, 26; in v. 30, how it will be on the day when the Son of man is revealed). The first, that of the days of Noah, is also found in Mt. 24:37–41, in more detailed form. The second, not found in Matthew, describes the life of the people of Sodom up to the moment of the catastrophe. This may be an elaboration suggested by the allusion to Lot's wife in v. 32.

vv. 31–32 With an "on that day" Luke introduces here the counsel for those on the housetops and in the field (Mt. 24:17–18; Mk. 13:15–16) to flee when the catastrophe arrives. He adds: Let them remember Lot's wife (and be warned not to tarry).

v. 33 (Mt. 10:39) Luke puts here the saying on gaining and losing one's life, but instead of "will find it" he has "will save it." (Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac have that reading in Mt. too.)

vv: 34–36 (Mt. 24:40–41) In Matthew this directly follows the example of Noah. Luke's version of the first instance is different. Two men will be on one bed (Mt.: in the field); one is taken and one is left. But Matthew's is probably more original. In the received text (A.V.), Matthew's version of the first instance has been interpolated here as v. 36.

v. 37 (Mt. 24:28) Luke introduces a question of the disciples as to where all this will take place. This may be just a literary device on his part for the purpose of closing the discourse with the effective saying about a (dead) body (Mt.: "carcass") and the eagles, which he had omitted after v. 24. The place will become readily discernible when the revelation occurs, just as a body can easily be located by observing the congregating eagles or buzzards. Jesus thus does not really answer the question of the disciples. In vv. 23–24 such curiosity was also set aside.

18:1–8 Parable of the Unjust Judge. A piece of Luke's special material. In unusual manner the purpose of Jesus' parable is stated at the outset. Allegedly he uttered it to (show) that they (the disciples of 17:22?) must pray constantly and not lose courage (if not heard immediately). As will appear, however, its point was more limited.

There was a judge who did not fear God and had no respect for man (Mt. 21:37). A widow kept coming to him, saying: give me justice over against my (legal) adversary. (A widow easily became an object of despoliation; e.g., by her husband's creditors or partners.) The judge did not wish (to act) for a time. (Meanwhile she came again and again.) Subsequently he said to himself (7:39) that, though he was the kind of man described in v. 2, on account of this widow's causing him trouble he would give judgment in her favor, lest she come "in the end" (? or "forever"?) and browbeat him. The parable also has an unusual conclusion. The Lord said: "Hear what the unjust judge says. Will not God (the just judge) similarly give judgment in favor of his elect that call to him by day and night and have patience with them (or "even if he is slow to anger *in their behalf?*" or "toward them," i.e., their adversaries)? Jesus drives this home with a final declaration: "Yea, he will quickly (Acts 12:7) give judgment in their favor." The parable was concerned with prayer for vindication against oppression and persecution. But the introduction seeks to generalize it along the lines of the parable of the friend at midnight (11:5–8).

A final question of Jesus is added, which seems to stand outside the parable. The judge is not God, as in v. 7, but the Son of man. Will he find faith on earth when he comes? Luke here is apparently putting a damper on prayer by Christians for vindication over their persecutors. Let them be sure that they themselves are in the proper frame of mind to receive the Son of man when he comes. By means of this conclusion and the introductory v. 1, Luke has striven to prevent the parable from doing harm.

18:9–14 Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. This is the fourth of the great parables (cf. 10:30 ff.; 15:11 ff.; 16:19 ff.) which Luke alone has preserved. In this case, as in the preceding parable, the occasion is given briefly. Jesus spoke it to some who trusted in themselves (instead of in God) because they were righteous and despised others. (They no doubt were Pharisees, but the word is avoided because of its use in the story.) Two men, one a Pharisee and one a publican (cf. on Mk. 2:14), went up to the Temple to pray (doubtless at the hour when sacrifice was being brought, 9 A.M. or 3 P.M.; cf. 1:10). This was evidently a custom on the part of pious Jews residing at Jerusalem (cf. Ecclus. 51:14); the allusion to it shows that the parable was spoken there. Apparently the scene is the Court of the Israelites, facing the great altar. The Pharisee took station by himself and prayed. (Silent prayer was not customary, so the text-reading, "he prayed to himself," is improbable.) He thanked God that he was not like other men, singling out three classes: robbers, unrighteous men (in 1 Cor. 6:9 the word has the special meaning of "defrauders"), adulterers—or "even men like this publican" (who thus must have been within the field of vision). He then enumerates his own good works: (1) He fasts twice a week (i.e., on Monday and Thursday, instead of just once a year on the day of Atonement—all that was legally required of any Jew). Such extra fasting was done by public-spirited men seeking to ward off evil from their people; thus we hear in the Talmud of a Rabbi Zadok of A.D. 50, who sat fasting in this manner for forty years "that Jerusalem might not be destroyed." (2) He gives (to charity) the tithe of whatever things he acquires. It is uncertain whether this means 10 per cent of all his income (which in an economy such as then prevailed consisted mostly of produce) or making sure that all agricultural products used in his house, whether raised by himself or bought in the market, had been properly tithed (cf. Deut. 14:22 ff. and other items added by inference from this law, such as those enumerated in 11:42, Mt. 23:23). A scrupulous Pharisee would even pay the tithe on what he used if any uncertainty existed as to whether it had been paid at the source.

Over against this picture of virtue stands that of the publican—the hated tax collector. He stood far off (whereas the Pharisee was in front) and did not wish (i.e., venture) to lift up his eyes to heaven, but beat his breast (a gesture of penitence and mourning; cf. 23:48) and asked God to have mercy on him, the sinner! Jesus declares that "this one (the publican) went down (from the Temple hill) to his house (in the residential district) as a justified one more than that one." The word "justified" is not to be taken in the Pauline sense (1 Cor. 4:4), but as the equivalent to Hebrew "more righteous than" (cf. Gen. 38:26, LXX). To the hearers of Jesus this only meant that the publican acted in a manner more pleasing to God than the Pharisee did.

The interpretation given by Jesus in this declaration would have been unacceptable to Pharisaic teachers, according to whom the publican would first have to make restitution for all the cheating he may have done before his penitence was of any significance. However, there can be little doubt that the publican is imagined as acting like the one of 19:8. But the impression which this parable has made on the mind of mankind depends on the contrast between the humility of the publican and the self-satisfied state of mind of the Pharisee. It illustrates the epithet "hypocrite," so often used by Jesus of the Pharisees, even where they are not explicitly mentioned (cf. Mt. 6:2, 5), and constitutes the most powerful critique of religious hypocrisy in the whole Christian heritage.

PART (III) II THE JUDAEAN PERIOD

18:15–23:56 (Mk. 10–15; Mt. 19–27)

A. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM

18:15–19:27 (Mk. 10; Mt. 19–20)

Luke here rejoins Mark's narrative from which he had departed in 9:50. For the purpose of comparing Luke with Mark and Matthew, it is advisable to begin a separate part here, though there is no real break in Luke until 19:27. Having begun the departure for Judaea in 9:51 and having given the substance of the discussion on divorce in 16:18, Luke omits Mk. 10:1–12, taking up at v. 13.

18:15–17 Jesus and the Children (Mk. 10:13–16; Mt. 19:13–15). Perhaps to suggest a defense of the disciples, Luke speaks of persons bringing even infants to Jesus. In the continuation, however, the word "children" is used. Jesus is described as calling them (i.e., the children) to him. Luke omits mention of the displeasure of Jesus at the action of the disciples as well as of his embracing and blessing the children in laying hands on them (cf. also 9:47).

18:18–30 On the Peril of Wealth (Mk. 10:17–31; Mt. 19:16–30)

vv. 18–23 Mark's colorful beginning is omitted. The individual who asks Jesus the question is called "a ruler" (Gr.

árchōn). The text then follows Mark with slight differences; the commandment "thou shalt not steal" is missing (as also in Matthew). That Jesus looked at him and loved him is omitted. Instead of saying, "In one thing you are backward," Jesus says, "In one thing you are deficient." Luke abridges the conclusion.

vv. 24–30 Jesus does not look about and address his disciples as in Mark, but "seeing him" (and his sorrowful state)—the ruler therefore has not departed as in Mark—he gives the exclamation about the difficulty of a rich man's entering the kingdom. Luke omits the shock this gave the disciples as well as the repetition of the saying (Mk. 10:24) and passes on directly to the remark about the camel and the needle's eye. In responding to the question of "those hearing" (Mk. 10:26: of the exceedingly astonished disciples) as to who then can be saved, Jesus does not first "look at them," but directly gives the saying of Mk. 10:27 in abridged form. Peter does not say that they have left *all things,* but rather their *own* things. In Jesus' assurance of reward, mention of the wife is added, mention of sisters is left out, "parents" replaces "father and mother," "fields" and "for my sake" are omitted. For Mark's receiving "hundredfold," Luke has "many times," and he omits specifying all that Mark lists in 10:30 as receivable "in this time." He drops the concluding saying about the last being first (used in 13:30).

18:31–34 The Third Passion Announcement (Mk. 10:32–34; Mt. 20:17–19). This Passion prediction has been separated rather widely from the other two (9:22, 44) because of Luke's interpolated central section, 9:51–18:14. The climactic effect which it had in Mark is thus lost. Luke leaves out the introductory detail about the situation; Jesus simply takes the Twelve aside and makes his statement. After the words about going up to Jerusalem, Luke injects a declaration of Jesus that all things will be fulfilled which were written through the Prophets concerning the Son of man. Omitting the betrayal to, and condemnation by, priests and scribes, Luke significantly puts all the blame on the Gentiles. The advance outline of the Passion story is given in passive rather than in active voice except for the final "after scourging him they will kill him." Luke, like Matthew, speaks of his rising up "on the third day" (Mk.: after three days). He adds a remark about the complete lack of understanding on the part of the disciples (cf. 9:45). This is evidently intended to answer questions as to how it was possible for the disciples to have been so cowardly at the time of the Passion and so unprepared for the message of the resurrection.

18:35–43 The Healing of the Blind Man at Jericho (Mk. 10:46–52; Mt. 20:29–34). Luke omits the story of the request of the sons of Zebedee, for he intends to bring in a more general equivalent later (22:24–26). In his total disinterestedness in Palestinian geography, Luke is not concerned about how Jesus happens to be in Jericho, which one would have no occasion to go to if one chose the route through Samaria, as 9:51 f. suggested. The fact is that he is simply following Mark here, who presupposes a journey via the Jordan valley, in which Jericho was necessarily the terminus of the next to the last lap. In divergence from Mark, he puts this episode at the approach to the city rather than after the departure from it. He abridges at the beginning, though he adds the touch that the blind man, whose name he omits, sat begging and that he heard the (sound of) the crowd passing through and inquired what this might be. The informants tell him that Jesus the Nazoraean is coming by (Mk.: he heard it was Jesus the Nazarene). The "many" who seek to silence him are identified by Luke as "those going before" (cf. Mk.: 11:9). Luke abridges Mk. 10:49–50; Jesus stands still and commands the man to be brought to him. The latter addresses Jesus as "Lord"—the Semitic "*Rabbounéi*" of Mark is avoided. Luke rounds out the conclusion of the story with the man's glorifying God and all the people's giving praise to God.

19:1–10 Zacchaeus. Luke here adds a piece of his special material. Jesus is passing through Jericho according to v. 1. A rich, chief publican named Zacchaeus (Heb. *Zakkai,* shortened form of Zechariah) "sought to see Jesus, who he was" (i.e., he strove to see which one in the approaching crowd was Jesus), but could not because he was too short. So he ran ahead and ascended a roadside sycamore (= sycamine, 17:6)—a tree with heavy branches that in Palestine grows only in the lower altitudes, and at this season was just in spring foliage. (There is a difficulty here. If Jesus were passing through the city, a roof rather than a tree ought to have been climbed. One could therefore infer that Luke ought to have put this before the entrance into Jericho. Trees are out of the question in the streets of a regular Oriental city. But the way to Jerusalem may not have led through the city proper. The concept "Jericho" can cover a whole township, including all the Herodian installations, some of which recent excavations have uncovered at the exit of the *Wadi el Qelt.*) When Jesus came to the place he looked up, and calling Zacchaeus by name (miraculous knowledge!) bade him hurry and come down, saying that he had to stay in Zacchaeus' house this day (which then meant going into the city proper). Zacchaeus obeyed and received Jesus as guest with great joy. This produced the same reaction (on the part of the Pharisees?) as had Jesus' eating with Levi and other publicans (Mk. 2:16). Zacchaeus, standing before Jesus (in receiving him as guest) said to the "Lord" that he was giving half of his possessions to the poor, and if he had robbed anyone he was making fourfold restitution (going far beyond the restoration of the full amount plus one-fifth required by Lev. 6:5, though in the case of sheep-stealing, fourfold recompense is mentioned in Ex. 21:37). Presumably this was to make good for all the cases where individual repayment was no longer possible, in view of decease or removal of the persons thus injured. As to his giving away *half* of his possessions to the poor, one must note that he did not become a disciple of Jesus in the sense of one devoting himself to the spreading of the gospel, but stayed with his family. His action thus may have been considered by Luke as exemplary for the layman. Jesus declared "on this day salvation has come about for this house (implying conversion of the family; Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac: 'in this house') for he, too, is a son of Abraham (cf. 13:16—not a Gentile—and so a member of the people that had God's promise). Here Jesus is fending off criticism such as was mentioned in Mk. 2:16. This element has apparently been dropped from the story in transmission. The salvation is explained by the remark, "For the Son of man has come to seek (15:4) and save (from perishing forever) that which is lost (the lost sheep)." By omitting reference to Israel here (contrast Mt. 15:24), Luke has given the saying a wider applicability. But the underlying material had the narrower Jewish viewpoint.

19:11–27 Parable of the Minas (Mt. 25: 14–30; cf. Mk. 13:34). Luke has connected this material with the preceding by a peculiar transitional statement. "When 'they' (i.e., his followers?) heard these things, he added thereto a parable because he was near to Jerusalem and because they thought that the kingdom of God was going to appear (from heaven) immediately." This is an interesting admission of Luke; the disciples were mistaken as to this. In the petition of the sons of Zebedee, which he has omitted, this expectation on the part of intimates of Jesus is likewise vividly reflected (Mk. 10:37). The connection with 19:1–10 seems rather loose. Apparently the remark about "salvation on this day" provided the excuse for passing on to this topic. Luke indicates in advance how he wants the parable to be understood, and underlines his intent with his "he said *therefore.*" But one cannot take the correctness of his interpretation for granted.

The parable, though it differs widely from Matthew's parable of the talents, is basically parallel to it. It cannot be from Q, for Matthew no doubt has preserved the Q form rather closely. One original element, however, may be preserved by Luke when he speaks of minas instead of talents. As the latter would have fitted the scope of his story much better, he would not have changed to minas had he read it in that form in his sources. In its Lucan version the parable has apparently been enriched under the stimulus of some event that made it more meaningful to those for whom it was so formulated. The man going on a journey is here metamorphosed into a nobleman who journeyed to a far country to obtain for himself a kingdom.

(Realistically this could only mean a journey to Rome to obtain it by grant of the Roman Senate, and the nobleman would have to be one with royal claims.) He entrusted some money to his servants with the instruction to trade with it. In comparison with Matthew, the minor change is made that there were *ten* servants, though afterward only three render accounting—a fact showing that Matthew's three is more original. Each receives not a different sum, but the same small amount of ten minas. (Luke meant the Attic mina worth about five to six dollars. This is a rather small amount for a nobleman to entrust; it would suit a small merchant much better.) Having done this he departed. His (fellow-) citizens, however, hated him and sent an embassy after him saying: "We do not wish this one to reign over us." (This is thinly veiled history; the story of Archelaus illustrates it, though Luke or his source may have been thinking of some more recent similar occasion. When that son of Herod journeyed to Rome in 4 B.C. to get confirmation for his kingship over Judaea (cf. Mt. 2:22), a Jewish delegation of fifty men also went there to object to his appointment, Jos., *Ant., 17,* 11). When the nobleman returned after receiving his kingdom (Archelaus was given the title of ethnarch only, but was popularly called "king"; cf. Mt. 2:22), he summoned the servants to whom he had entrusted money to find out what each had made in handling it. The first said, "Lord (veiled allusion to the interpretation as referring to Christ), thy mina has produced in addition ten minas (the formulation suggests that originally each had received only *one* mina). He is praised as "good servant"; because he was faithful over a trifle, he shall be in the position of having power over ten cities. The second (Codex D, better in view of v. 20, has: another) came, reporting, "Lord thy mina has made five minas." In this case the praise is omitted, but a governorship over five cities is conferred. (Yet) another brought back the mina, saying that he had kept it hidden in his sweatband (Gr. *soudarion,* from Lat. *sudarium;* Mt.: in the earth), fearing his master as a hard man who takes what he has not deposited (Mk. 6:29) and reaps what he has not sown. This part of the parable closely parallels Mt. 25:24–29. The master calls the man a wicked (Mt.: plus "lazy") servant whom he will judge out of his own mouth (i.e., the fellow has given his own verdict). Knowing what he did about his master, why did he not put the money on the table (of the moneylenders) so that when he returned he could have drawn it with interest? He then ordered the bystanders (attendants) to take the mina from him and give it to the one who had the ten minas. (Their protest in v. 25 that that individual already has ten is probably an interpolation since no "He answered" follows.) In the justifying dictum: "To him that hath shall be given" (cf. already 8:18 and parallels), the emphasis is on the deprivation of the wicked servant, not on the reward of competent servants, as in Matthew. But in contrast to the latter's version, there is no allusion to a further punishment of the wicked servant. Instead, accounts are now squared with the citizens of v. 14. "But these enemies of mine who did not want me to reign over them lead hither and cut them down in my presence." That Archelaus or any other princeling of Roman times was able to take such vengeance may be doubted; but it was in the old, despotic tradition as it lived on in folk tales, and that sort of thing could occur at Rome itself, e.g. under Severus.

For Luke, as for Matthew, the chief actor represents Jesus; his journey to the far country is Jesus' departure to heaven; his return is the Second Coming (Gr. *parousía*). But in Luke's version further refinements have been added. Presenting the chief actor as a nobleman who will return as king corresponds clearly to the early Christian belief of the return of Jesus as Messiah (= king). The scope of the parable has also been broadened with an eye to those who opposed Jesus' Messiahship, viz., the Jews who at this time were including in their prayers to God "the blessing (euphemistic for "curse") of the *Mīnīm*" (or "sects," primarily meaning the Christians). The king's judgment over these adversaries is made the crowning feature of the parable.

As noted above, Luke's introductory statement of 19:11 shows that for him the main idea was to suggest that the kingdom of God was not going to appear immediately with Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem. He thus must have placed especial weight on the journey to a far country and a delay in the nobleman's return. His readers probably knew—what is not clear at all to a modern reader—that Rome kept aspirants to small thrones cooling their heels for a long while, especially when there was opposition on the part of their countrymen.

B. THE DAYS IN JERUSALEM

19:28–21:38 (Mk. 11–13; Mt. 21–25)

19:28–38 The Entry into Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1–10; Mt. 21:1–9). Luke seizes on the reference to Jerusalem in Mk. 11:1 and fashions a preliminary sentence both to introduce the narrative and to link it up with the previous discourse. "And saying these things Jesus journeyed forward, going up to Jerusalem." The promised stay at the house of Zacchaeus (19:5) is lost sight of. Luke speaks of Jesus' drawing near to Bethphage and Bethany unto the mount called "of Olives," which corresponds to the Old Testament term (cf. Zech., 14:4; 2 Sam. 15:30). It seems likely that Luke's text originally contained only one of the village names—most probably Bethany, since that is what Mark offered. The two disciples sent ahead receive the same instructions as in Mark. The item about their finding the colt tied at the door is left out, but Luke adds that when they loosed it "its lords" (= owners, Semitic expression; Mk.: "some of those standing there") raised objection. When they had led the colt to Jesus, they cast their garments upon it and had him mount it (Mk.: he sat upon it). In the account of the procession, Luke leaves out any mention of the cutting of bunches of foliage (Mk., Mt.: branches from the trees). He has, however, a new detail. When they draw near to the (point of steepest) descent of the Mount of the Olive Trees (cf. above), the whole crowd (6:17) of disciples begins to praise God joyously with loud voice (Luke's substitute for Mark's "Hosanna," which he avoids as a Semitic word) on account of all the mighty works (= miracles, 10:13) they had seen. He quotes them as saying, "Blessed be he that cometh, the king, in the name of the Lord. In heaven peace and glory in the highest."

Luke's source here was Mark, and the changes he makes are significant for the slant which he desires to give this story. Particularly important is the fact that he omits the blessing over the coming kingdom of David. This was too political. But why does he go out of his way to inject *the king* into the Psalm quotation (Ps. 118:25)? His introductory words, that the disciples praised God for all the miracles they had seen, suggests that Jesus, so far as the contemporary situation was concerned, was being hailed as king in a nonpolitical sense. Mark's "Hosanna in the highest" is changed to "glory in the highest," and before that is put *"in heaven* peace." This contrasts with the angels' message of "peace on earth," which was preceded by "glory to God in the highest" (2:14). Is Luke here hinting at Jesus' return from this same Olivet to heaven and at his kingship there (cf. Acts 17:7) as well as at his return with regal power at the identical place (Acts 1:6, 11)? The parable of the minas, 19:12 f., has already set the stage for such thoughts with its account of the nobleman. Even if Luke were describing this as Messianic entry, the fact would remain that he has declared the disciples in error as to the immediate coming of the kingdom of God (19:11), and so he must view this event as at best prophetic of what will come about when God disposes (Acts 1:6–7).

19:39–44 Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem. Luke here injects a piece of special material. Some of the Pharisees—their presence is unexplained; the Sinaitic Syriac omits them—in the crowd, addressing Jesus as "Teacher," urged him to rebuke his disciples for what they were saying. He replied that if these were to be silent, the stones would cry out (i.e., to hail the Messiah; for what has been predicted in Zech. 9:9 must be fulfilled.)

As Jesus drew near and saw the city, he wept over it, and addressed it thus: "If only thou also (like the disciples) didst know on this very day the things that are unto peace (i.e., the conditions of peace, cf. 14:32, in this case peace with God) . . . !" (The incomplete sentence implies:

How differently thou wouldst act, and how different thy fate—over which Jesus weeps in prophetic foreknowledge—would be!) But now it (i.e., thy fate) is concealed from thy eyes (through a divine predestination, which, however, does not relieve the city of its guilt). This is an impressive element in the narrative. It helps also to remove any thought that Jesus hoped to be accepted as Messiah. Jesus then outlines the fate that moves him to tears. The phrases used are colored by Luke's knowledge of the siege operations of A.D. 70. The city's enemies will throw up around it a palisade wall, and surround it and hem it in from all sides, and will level it [and its children, i.e., inhabitants in it—perhaps an old gloss or belonging after "hem it"] and will not leave one stone upon another (21:6) because it did not recognize the time of its (salutary divine) visitation (cf. 1:68, 1:16), i.e., this day of Jesus' arrival. This prediction of the fall of Jerusalem anticipates the apocalypse of chap. 21 (= Mk. 13).

19:45–46 Jesus in the Temple; Its Cleansing (Mk. 11:11, 15–19; Mt. 21:10–17; Jn. 2:13–17). Luke abridges Mark's account drastically. Jesus apparently goes directly from the Mount to the Temple. He avoids any visit to the city (which lay south and west of the Temple) until the evening of the Passover meal. There is no mention, however, of the inspection of the Temple, which in Mark precedes the cleansing by a day. Luke has Jesus drive out the vendors immediately. His question in Mk.: "Is it not written, etc.?" is changed to an assertion: "It is written." The first quotation (Is. 56:7) is simplified to "my house shall be a house of prayer." Luke does not try to carry through a Passion week with day-by-day happenings, as does Mark, and hence generalizes in v. 47, "Jesus was teaching daily in the Temple" (inferred from Mk. 14:49?). He formulates the reaction of the leaders freely in parallelism to Mark. The high priests and scribes and the first men of the people "did not find what they could do" (Mk.: high priests and scribes sought to destroy him, for they feared him). Luke adds, "For the whole people hung upon him hearing him" (Mk.: the whole crowd was amazed at his teaching). He omits the departure "from the city" (Mk.: 11:19) and the fig-tree incident of Mk. 11:20–25. The routine of Jesus is succinctly stated later in 21:37; the days were spent in the Temple, the nights on Olivet.

20:1–8 The Question about Authority (Mk. 11:27–33; Mt. 21:23–27). The introductory "it happened on one of these days" suggests a prolonged activity of this nature. The question of the "high priests and scribes, with the elders (also present)," is thus a question regarding his authority to teach and preach in the Temple (in Mk. it refers to the cleansing of the Temple; cf. Jn. 2:18). The exchange proceeds as in Mark with slight abridgments and variations of expression. The most noteworthy differences are in v. 6 as compared with Mk. 11:32. In place of Mark's, "But shall we say 'of men?' They feared the people," Luke has, "If we say 'of men' the whole people will stone us." (Cf. Acts 14:19.)

20:9–19 Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk. 12:1–12; Mt. 21:33–46). According to the best manuscripts, Jesus addresses this parable to the people, but v. 19 suggests it was the leaders (Codex D omits "to the people"). Luke does not have the details about the planting of the vineyard, but proceeds directly to its rental to tenant farmers. The owner's subsequent departure is described as for a long period. The story at first runs as in Mark with only minor variations. In the case of the second servant sent to collect rent (in the form of "fruit of the vine"), Luke merely omits that the husbandman punched him in the head, but adds that they sent him forth empty handed. In the case of the third servant, a more marked variation occurs: he is not slain, but only wounded and cast out of the vineyard. Luke wants to confine the slaying to the "beloved son." Correctly feeling that Mark's reference to the many others whom they struck and killed damages the effect of the parable, Luke leaves this out. The lord (Semitism) of the vineyard asks himself what he should do? He then declares his intention to send his beloved son. (In Mk. the sending of him as "last one" was recorded objectively.) A seemingly trifling but important change is made in v. 15: they threw him out of the vineyard and killed him (Mk.: they killed him and threw him out of the vineyard). What the owner of the vineyard will do is described as in Mark, but Luke follows that with an exclamation of the hearers: "May it not happen!" (This presupposes an understanding on their part that Jesus was speaking of the Jews as God's tenant farmers.) Jesus thereupon fixes his eye upon them (cf. Mk. 10:27) and asks what then is this that is written about the stone that the builders rejected (Ps. 118:22)? (The additional verse that Mark included is omitted.) The purpose of this quotation is not made clear by Luke, anymore than it was by Mark; one may infer that Jesus is equating the rejected and slain son with the stone that was rejected and yet became the cornerstone or, better, keystone (in an arch). Luke renders the quotation more solemn by an explanatory addition: everyone who falls on this stone will be shattered, and him on whom it falls, it will crush. (This saying is also found in Mt. 21:44 in the best manuscripts, but is hardly in the right position there; see p. 170.) It is not entirely lucid from a realistic angle, since in one case the stone is on the ground and in the other case in an elevated position. However, what Luke means to bring out is the inescapable nemesis for those who reject Jesus. The incident ends as in Mark, except that the high priests and scribes are mentioned as the ones seeking to lay hands on Jesus, and that the words "they left him and went away" are omitted.

20:20–26 The Question of the Pharisees (Mk. 12:13–17; Mt. 22:15–22). Luke elaborates the simple introduction of Mark but omits the reference to the Pharisees and Herodians. (The Pharisees, strangely, are left out since their mention in 19:39.) According to his presentation the discomfited leaders lying in wait (alternate reading: departing) sent observers, who pretended to be righteous men, that they might catch him through his word (i.e., some utterance) so that they might hand him over to the authority and power of the governor. The story then follows Mark with minor variations, notably in the compliments given Jesus in v. 21. Luke uses a Greek word for "tax" rather than the Latin loan word employed by Mark; instead of speaking of the "hypocrisy" of the questioners, he refers to their "craftiness," and he omits Jesus' question: "Why do you tempt me?" He runs together the request for a denarius and the question as to the likeness and inscription on it. The conclusion, like the beginning, is given more elaborately: they were not able to catch him in an utterance before the people, and marveling at his answer, remained silent (Mk.: they were amazed at him).

20:27–40 The Question of the Sadducees (Mk. 12:18–27; Mt. 22:23–33). Luke here follows Mark with minor variations. He speaks of the various husbands of the woman, whose case is adduced by the Sadducees to ridicule the resurrection doctrine, as dying childless (instead of Mark's Semitism "not leaving seed"). In v. 31 the construction is not very good. The Sinaitic Syriac renders it: "The second took her, and the third and so all seven, and died childless." Jesus does not, as in Mk. 12:24, tell the Sadducees that they are mistaken, etc., but philosophizes: the children of this world-age marry and are given in marriage (the latter referring to females), but those held worthy of sharing in that (coming) world-age and the resurrection of the dead are like the angels [and are sons of God]. (The bracketed words are missing in the Sinaitic Syriac and are probably a variant of the preceding phrase.) This makes Jesus teach only a partial resurrection (cf. 14: 14). After the saying that God is God of the living, Luke adds "for all (whose God he is) live unto (= for) him," but he omits Jesus' closing statement of Mk. 12:27. He ends the incident with an approving comment by the (Pharisaic) scribes and an allusion to their not daring to ask any more questions—echoes of Mk. 12:28. Luke omits the story which that verse introduced, having used a version of it in 10: 25–28.

20:41–44 The Son of David (Mk. 12:35–37; Mt. 22:41–46). Luke abridges the introductory description of the circumstances in which the saying was spoken, but keeps the substance unchanged. One must assume that the scene is the Temple and that Jesus is addressing the people. He omits as unnecessary (cf. v. 40) the allusion to the scribes in the question: "How do they say that Christ is David's son?" Instead of David's speaking "in the Holy Spirit," he speaks "in the book of Psalms." The Marcan statement about the great crowd listening with pleasure is dropped.

20:45–47 Discourse against Pharisaism (Mk. 12:38–40; Mt. 23:1–36). Rather than being incidental to Jesus' teaching, this is spoken to the disciples in the hearing of the people. Mark's account is closely followed except that Luke speaks of the scribes "loving" salutations. He does not, like Matthew, expand this into a long invective against scribes (and Pharisees).

21:1–4 The Widow's Mite (Mk. 12:41–44). Luke seeks to preserve continuity of situation, whereas in Mark this is clearly a different incident. Looking up, Jesus sees the rich (Mk.: the crowd) throwing their gifts (Mk.: "copper") into the treasury. The remarks of Jesus in Mk. 12:44–45 are abridged and there are slight changes of diction. Luke omits equating the two lepta with the kodrantes (quadrans) and the summoning of the disciples. He simplifies the final sentence.

21:5–7 Prediction of the Destruction of the Temple (Mk. 13:1–4; Mt. 24:1–3). Again Luke seeks to preserve continuity of situation. There is no departure from the Temple. Not one of Jesus' disciples, but some other persons, make the comment which elicits Jesus' response; perhaps the disciples were left out here because they had already received similar instruction in 17:22 f. Luke speaks of the Temple being adorned with beautiful stones and votive gifts (cf. 2 Macc. 9:16). Mark's question, "Do you see all these buildings?" is turned into the statement that as for these things which they are beholding (i.e., the walls), the time will come when no stone will be left upon another! Mark's separate scene, of Jesus sitting on the Mount of Olives and of three disciples questioning him privately, is canceled. Instead, "some persons" query him, addressing him as "Teacher." (The disciples always say "Lord" or "Master" in Luke.) The second half of the question in Mk. 13:4, concerning the sign indicating when these things will be *completed,* is weakened to "when these things are about to *happen.*" The Marcan phrase was eschatological, while Luke is thinking of the destruction of Jerusalem, which, when he wrote, lay in the past, and with no eschatological happenings having occurred. We may thus expect Luke's version of Mark's apocalypse to be a modified one.

The Synoptic Apocalypse

21:8–36 (Mk. 13:5–37; Mt. 24:4–36)

21:8–11 Signs of the Second Coming (Mk. 13:5–8; Mt. 24:4–8). There is warning against deception (but not by "some one" as in Mark). The phrase "the time has come" is dropped as well as the prediction of a partial success of the deceivers. Instead, Jesus warns against following them. Luke leaves out the "rumors of wars" and substitutes "tumults." He adds a "first" to the saying that these things must happen and revises "the end is not yet" to "the end is not immediately." A break is seemingly made after v. 9 with a new "then he said to them" (but missing in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac). Luke elaborates in v. 11 by adding "epidemics, frightening things and great signs from heaven." He omits the important Marcan reference to this being "the beginning of the sufferings" (i.e., "the travails of the Messiah," a technical term in rabbinic texts, referring to the tribulations prior to the Messiah's coming).

21:12–19 Admonitions for the Beginning of the Sufferings (Mk. 13:9–13; Mt. 24:9–14). Instead of Jesus' warning, "But take heed to yourselves," Luke writes, "But before all these things," i.e., what Jesus now is describing chronologically precedes what he was speaking about in vv. 8–11. This indicates that the persecutions of which he now speaks already have come, and thus were not the travails of the Messiah. Luke adds and omits freely in his reworking of Mark's description—influenced, no doubt, by his knowledge of what had actually happened. He prefixes "arrests and persecutions" to "handing over to synagogues"; drops the "council," but adds "prisons."

They will be *led away* to kings and governors for the sake of *Christ's name.* For Mark's "unto witness to them" Luke has "the outcome for you will be unto witness," i.e., to bear witness. He urges them therefore to put into their hearts (i.e., to fix this point firmly in their minds), not to prepare their apology in advance. He, Christ, will give them speech (literally mouth) and wisdom, against which all their adversaries cannot stand (cf. Acts 6:10). Luke words the prediction about denunciation differently, omitting the allusions to fathers betraying children or children killing parents, but adding reference to relatives and friends. He also injects the comforting assurance of v. 18 that not a hair of their heads will perish (without God's providential will; cf. 12:7; Mt. 10:30). An interesting change is made in the last statement: by your *endurance* you will save your souls (= yourselves). That he is thinking of eternal life is patent, for otherwise this would be disregard of divine sovereignty (cf. Mt. 10:22).

21:20–24 The Crisis in Judaea (Mk. 13: 14–20; Mt. 24:15–22). Luke has eliminated the reference to the mysterious "abomination of desolation" of Daniel, which according to Mark was the signal for the apocalyptic events and for the coming of the Son of man. He looks back on the Jewish war of A.D. 68–70, and so his equivalent to Mk. 13:14–20 is history put in predictive form. When they see Jerusalem surrounded by army camps (a vivid idea of these can be gained from the aerial views of the fortress of Masada and its environs taken by Israelis and published in popular magazines), then let them know that *its desolation* (not the *end*) is near. The Christians in Judaea are to flee into the mountains, as in Mark, but the vivid exhortations of Mk. 13:15–16 are replaced by the thought that those in the city are to leave it, and those outside are not to enter it. The explanation is added that these are days of retribution and of fulfillment of all things that are written (in Old Testament prophecy). The Woe over the pregnant or nursing women (Mk. 13: 17) is retained, but the advice to pray (Mk. 13:18) is left out. The unparalleled tribulation of Mk. 13:19 is modified to a great distress on earth and wrath upon this (Jewish) people. In place of the shortening of the days for the sake of the elect (Mk. 13:20), Luke substitutes a description of how the Jews will be cut down by the sword and led captive (into slavery) among all peoples; Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles (Zech. 12:3) until the "times of the Gentiles" are fulfilled. ("Times" is a somewhat cryptic term; in Dan. 12:7 it meant "years," but Luke may not have understood the "times of the Gentiles" as so short if he placed any stress on the "three and one-half times" of Dan.)

21:25–28 The Second Coming of the Son of Man (Mk. 13:24–27; Mt. 24:29–31). Luke omits the prediction about the false Messiahs and miracleworkers (Mk. 13:21–23), perhaps because this was already touched upon in 21:8 (= Mk. 13:6). He goes on to speak of the portents. Instead of Mark's darkening of sun and moon and falling of stars, Luke mentions "signs" on sun, moon, and stars. He interjects the new idea that on the earth there will be a distress of nations in alarm over the roaring of sea and waves, with men fainting from fear and expectation of the things coming to the world. He then resumes Mark's "the powers in the heavens will be shaken" and continues with the appearance of the Son of man on a cloud (Mk.: the clouds). However, he leaves out the sending forth of the angels to bring home the elect (Mk. 13:27). He urges his readers to look up and raise their heads, when these things *begin* to happen, because (then) their redemption will be drawing near.

21:29–31 Parable of the Fig Tree (Mk. 13:28–29; Mt. 24:32–33). For Mark's "learn a parable from the fig tree" Luke substitutes that he spoke a parable to them beginning with: "See the fig tree *and all the trees.*" (He evidently reasoned that what was said was true of any tree.) He shortens Mark's description to "as soon as they come into leaf, seeing for yourselves, you know that the summer is already near!" The final point is: "Know that the kingdom of God is near (Mk.: know that he—the Son of man—is at the doors).

21:32–33 The Time of the Second Coming (Mk. 13:30–32; Mt. 24:34–36). Luke retains Mk. 13:30–31, but has no equivalent for v. 32, according to which neither angels nor the Son know the exact day. For Luke, the Son of man knows it, but it is nobody else's business (cf. Acts 1:7).

21:34–36 The Lucan Conclusion of the Discourse. Mark's discourse closed with the admonition to watch, illustrated by the parable of the servants who must be prepared for their master's return at any hour. Luke provides a conclusion of his own. He preserves the idea of watching, but omits the Marcan parable and adds very different instructions. They are to watch that their hearts do not become heavy through gluttony, drunkenness, and cares about material things, lest that day fall on them suddenly like a net (clapping down upon a bird or small animal). The day (of wrath over the nations; cf. Ezek. 30:3) will certainly come over all those "sitting on the face of the whole earth" (Semitic phraseology; the Palestinian scene for the Last Judgment is given up). The readers are exhorted to be watchful at all times about praying (or be watchful, praying at all times?) that they may be able to escape all these things that are to come and to stand before (the Judgment seat of) the Son of man.

Luke has retained the ideas of the Second Coming and of the world Judgment, but these events are no longer expected immediately. The power of the Holy Spirit and the task of bearing witness (Acts 1:8) are the present realities.

21:37–38 Summary Remark concerning the Ministry in Jerusalem. Cf. 19:47–48. This is a piece peculiar to Luke. He knows nothing of Jesus' going out to Bethany in the evenings. Jesus spent his nights (camping out?) on the Mount that is called "of olives" and taught daily in the Temple. All the people came early to the Temple in order to hear him.

In the Ferrar group of manuscripts, the story of the woman taken in adultery (Jn. 7:55–8:11) is introduced after 21:38—an obviously unsuitable place.

C. THE PASSION NARRATIVE

22:1–23:56 (Mk. 14–15; Mt. 26–27)

22:1–2 The Plot of the High Priests and Scribes (Mk. 14:1–2; Mt. 26:1–5; cf. Jn. 11:47–57). While Matthew expands Mark's account here, Luke abridges it. He omits reference to the two days and mistakenly speaks of the approach of "the Unleavened Bread festival which is called the Passover"; they were separate feasts, the former immediately following on the latter. In the account of the conspiracy he leaves out the idea of a seizure of Jesus "by stealth," and the decision not to act at the festival time. He evidently saw the contradiction between this and the crucifixion on the Passover.

22:3–6 The Betrayal by Judas (Mk. 14:10–11; Mt. 26:14–16). Luke omits the anointing in Bethany, Mk. 14:3–9. Why did he bypass this impressive narrative? He has canceled out any sojourns at Bethany (indeed, it is questionable whether the two mentions of the name now found in 19:29, 24:50 go back to him), and in the light of 21:37–38 there was no place in which he could use such a story. There is furthermore a parallelism between the anointing for burial at Bethany and the intended anointing after burial by women belonging to Jesus' immediate following (23:56, 24:1). The latter anointing could not be carried out and was superfluous, since Jesus was raised from the dead. Such considerations may have led Luke to omit Mk. 14:3 ff. and to introduce a somewhat similar incident, differently pointed up, in 7:36 ff.

He now passes on to the betrayal by Judas. He expands the Marcan story a bit, but the point of chief importance is his attempt to account for the action of Judas. "Satan entered into Judas, the one called Iscariotes" (cf. 6:16, where he was "Judas Iscariotes"). In the Temptation of Christ, the Devil had desisted until a favorable time should come (4:13). That time had now arrived. Apparently Luke thinks of the Devil as inactive during the ministry of Jesus, but now he is assailing Jesus again. That Judas belonged "to the number of the Twelve" is solemnly stressed. He goes to converse with the high priests *and the captains* (Gr. *stratēgoí;* there was a captain of the Temple, Acts 4:1, etc., but the word was evidently used in the plural to include his subordinates). Luke notes that Judas "agreed" (to the betrayal proposition that was made to him), and that the opportunity he sought was one when Jesus would be "apart from the crowd."

22:7–13 Preparations for the Passover (Mk. 14:12–16; Mt. 26:17–19). Luke speaks of the arrival of the Unleavened Bread Festival on which it was necessary to sacrifice the Passover, i.e., to bring the Passover sacrifice. Since in Luke's day there was no longer any Passover sacrifice, it is understandable that the Mazzoth feast should have the main emphasis in the public mind. The disciples do not have to remind Jesus of the need of Passover preparations, as in Mark; he directs Peter and John (Mk.: two disciples) to go and prepare it. They ask him where he wants it prepared (the story thus loses some of the mysteriousness it has in Mark). From there on Luke closely follows Mark's version of the story. He omits the word "ready" of Mk. 14:15, and drops some self-evident words of v. 16.

The Last Supper

22:14–38 (Mk. 14:17–25; Mt. 26:20–29)

22:14 (21–23) The Beginning of the Meal (Mk. 14:17–21; Mt. 26:20–25). The arrival of Jesus and the Twelve is not mentioned; instead, Luke says that when the hour came "he reclined, and the Apostles (= the Twelve) were with him." The incident about the prospective betrayer (Mk. 14:18–21) is transferred to 22:21–23.

22:15–20 The Institution of the Lord's Supper (Mk. 14:22–25; Mt. 26:26–29). Luke introduces some special material here. Jesus expresses his longing to eat this Passover with them before he suffers. He will not eat it again until it is fulfilled (i.e., attains its ultimate significance) in the kingdom of God (v. 16). (Luke may be implying that Christians are not to celebrate the Passover either.) Receiving the cup (handed him), he speaks the blessing over it and thereupon bids them divide it among themselves; he is not going to drink of the fruit of the vine until God's kingdom arrives. (The obvious parallelism of the explanatory clause of v. 18 with that of v. 16 in such close succession suggests that a directive to divide bread among themselves may have been left out after v. 16 owing to its occurrence in v. 19. At any rate, v. 17 anticipates v. 20 and makes it superfluous.)

Omitting Mark's "while they were eating," the present text of Luke gives the essentials of the Communion rite in a form close to that of 1 Cor. 11:23–25. It is questionable, however, whether vv. 19–20 are not simply an addition to the text of Luke, made later in the interest of harmonization. An end was seemingly reached in v. 18. If that be so, the objective of Luke was simply to tell of Jesus' last Passover meal, with the latter regarded as prophetic of the Messianic banquet. Luke would then have regarded the Communion rite as ecclesiastical in origin, not as instituted by Jesus. It was difficult for churchmen to let such a divergent portrayal of the Supper stand, owing to the desirability of obtaining comformity for their ritual; the Fourth Gospel's complete omission of the rite was easier to tolerate, on the basis of a theory that this book was only supplementary to the other Gospels. (The R.S.V. keeps v. 19a.)

22:21–38 Last Utterances of Jesus

a) *Prophecy of the betrayal,* 22:21–23. Luke has shifted the position of this, from after v. 14 (cf. Mk. 14:18–21; Mt. 26:21–25). It should be obvious that this would be a most unnatural thing to do had he described a Communion rite in the preceding section. At the beginning he uses distinctive phraseology. Jesus says: "The hand of the one betraying me is with me on the table" (i.e., the traitor is in the group reclining near the low, small table on which food was placed, cf. p. 312, and hence laid his hand on the same table as Jesus in partaking of it). The author thus cancels Mark's "dipping into the same dish," which may have seemed too strange to Western readers. (We, too, like to think of the Last Supper as conducted in our own manner, as Leonardo da Vinci painted it.) In the remark about the Son of man's departure, he substitutes "according to what is determined" for Mark's "as is written concerning him." He adds a discussion among the disciples concerning who among them might be the one that was going to do this (cf. Matthew's different handling of the matter).

b) *On rank in the kingdom of God,* 22:24–30 (Mk. 10:42–45; Mt. 20:25–28; 19:28). Luke here incorporates an incident leading to instruction by Jesus. There arose a quarrel among them as to who among them was to be regarded as the greatest. (This is really a parallel to Mk. 10:35–44, but with elimination of the request of the sons of Zebedee.) The instruction given by Jesus is that of Mk. 10:42 f. (Mt. 20:25 f.), with omission of the "you know" as unsuitable here. There are, however, interesting variations. Thus Mark's "those thinking to rule the peoples dominate them" is simplified to "ruling," and that their great ones "lord it over them" is replaced by "those having power over them are called benefactors." (The sing. *euergétēs* was a title borne by various Hellenistic kings of the past.) Mark's "whoever would be great among you, etc.," is changed to "let the greatest among you become as the youngest" (who is expected to serve; cf. Acts 5:6, 10). Luke does not include the climactic Mk. 10:45, though a part of its thought—about the Son of man's serving—is taken over and developed further. A rhetorical question establishes that it is the way of the world that he who sits at table is greater than he who serves. Yet Jesus (though unquestionably the greatest) has been in their midst as one that serves, and thus has set an example for them (which Jn. 13:1–11 makes vivid and considers the supreme thing in the occasion of the final meal).

In vv. 28 f. Luke introduces a praise and reward of the disciples. They alone have remained with Jesus in his trials (i.e., persecutions and sufferings, of which, however, no mention has been made; the words would seem formulated out of the mind of the living Christ, in the light of their later experiences). And so, just as his Father has "bequeathed" (the verb hints at the related noun "testament") the kingdom to him, so Jesus is bequeathing them (this privilege:) that they may eat and drink at his table in his kingdom and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (The words about the banquet may have been added by Luke to fit the saying, which does not contain this element in Mt. 19:28, into the present connection.)

c) *Prediction of Peter's denial,* 22:31–34. Luke has placed this prediction among the utterances at the Passover meal (in Mk. it was spoken after the meal, on the way to the Mount of Olives). He leaves out the words of Peter that elicited it. Simon is warned that Satan has sought them (the disciples) to sift them as wheat (i.e., to shake them as in a sieve—fig. of temptation through troubles; the thought is not of sifting in our sense). But Jesus has prayed for him (in particular) that his faith may not depart. And when he has turned back (Acts 3:19), then let him strengthen (Rev. 3:2) his brethren. (This reflects both Peter's return to the fold and his early role in the Church.) Luke then adds briefly a prediction of Peter's threefold denial before the cock crows. In Mk. 14:30 this is spoken on the way to Gethsemane, and the cock is to crow twice.

d) *Retrospect and prospect,* 22:35–38. Luke closes the last utterances with more of his special material. Jesus asks his disciples whether they had suffered want in any respect when he sent them forth without purse, bag, or sandals. On their denial of this, he declares that henceforth they should take along purse and bag (no mention of sandals), and whoever has no sword let him (even) sell his mantle to buy one. (These instructions hardly suit the situation in which they were then living; they are apparently directives of the heavenly Christ for missionary activity. There was evidently a certain time in the history of the Primitive Church when it seemed desirable for Christian missionaries to arm themselves—perhaps in the chaotic conditions preceding the Jewish war of A.D. 68 when assassination was rife.)

22:39 On the Way to the Mount of Olives (cf. Mk. 14:26–31; Mt. 26:30–35). Luke rephrases Mark's opening sentence, leaving out the hymn singing, and adding that "according to (his) custom" Jesus went out to the Mount of the Olives. He notes, too, that the disciples followed Jesus. Luke omits the entire episode in which Jesus prophesies that they will all be offended, thus also getting rid of Jesus' prediction that he would precede them to Galilee after he was raised up. He has already used the prediction of the betrayal of Peter in 22:34 and so can pass on immediately to the next episode.

22:40–46 Gethsemane (Mk. 14:32–42; Mt. 26:36–46). Luke omits the name Gethsemane in order not to burden his readers unnecessarily with what Greeks considered "barbarian" words. Having arrived at "the place," Jesus urged his disciples to pray that they enter not into temptation (cf. again in v. 46). He pulled himself away from them the distance of a stone's throw, knelt down (Mk.: "he fell on the ground"), and prayed. Luke thus omits leaving the others and going farther with Peter, James, and John. According to him Jesus prays only once—not thrice (a reduction probably made in the interest of shielding the disciples from criticism because of their somnolence). In the prayer itself the Aramaic *"Abba"* is deleted as well as "all things are possible to thee"; "if thou wilt" is introduced after "Father," and the final "not as I will" is changed to "not my will but thine be done."

In vv. 43–44 there is some new material. An angel appeared to Jesus from heaven, strengthening him. When he was come into fear of death (Gr. *agōnía;* surprising after v. 43), he prayed harder, and his perspiration "became like drops of blood, falling to the ground" (i.e., ran from him as blood runs?). Perhaps these verses are two different interpolations drawn from lost Gospels. They are missing in some important Codices and translations. Jesus' state of mind, as presupposed by them, is out of tune with the attitude of perfect accord with the Father's will expressed in v. 42.

Luke adds more detail in v. 45. Jesus "arose" from the prayer; on coming to the disciples he found them sleeping "from sorrow" (an obvious attempt to provide a justifying explanation). He did not address just Peter, as in Mark, but all of them, and the rebuke is softened to a mere "why do you sleep?" The word "watch" is dropped, and with an eye on Mk. 14:42 the word "arise" is prefixed to the admonition (of v. 40) to pray that they may not be tempted. The difficult "it is enough" and what follows in Mk. 14:41–42 are left out.

22:47–53 The Betrayal and Arrest (Mk. 14:43–52; Mt. 26:47–56). Luke omits that the crowd was armed. The account of the sign given them by Judas and of how he actually kissed Jesus is also expunged. Jesus addresses the approaching betrayer with, "Wouldst thou betray the Son of man with a kiss?" There is no mention of a seizure of Jesus. Whereas in Mark one of the bystanders draws a sword and smites, in Luke "those about Jesus," seeing what was going to happen, ask, "Lord, shall we strike with a sword?" and one of them (without awaiting an answer) takes action. Luke is specific: the "right" ear of the high priest's servant was cut off. Jesus says, "Let it go even to this point" (Lev. 26:18, LXX, i.e., "of my arrest"? or, "and no farther"?) and miraculously heals the man by touching his ear. Jesus then addresses those who had come against him—including the high priests and officers of the Temple and elders *in person*—with words similar to Mk. 14:48–49, adding that this (the night) is their hour (i.e., one suitable for such shady undertakings) and (that of) the power of darkness (i.e., the Devil is operative). The flight of the disciples and the story of the youth in Mk. 14:51–52 are omitted.

22:54–71 Jesus before the Synedrium; Peter's Denial (Mk. 14:53–72; Mt. 26:57–75; cf. Jn. 18:12–26). Jesus is seized and conducted to the house of the high priest, whose name is not given (but cf. 3:2). Luke omits the gathering there of high priest, scribes, and elders. He passes on immediately to the scene of Peter in the courtyard and mentions the kindling of a fire, at which the disciple sat down in the midst of the group around it. He then relates the story of the denial much as does Mark, but contents himself with the single cockcrow after the three denials (as v. 34 had predicted). He adds the effective touch that the Lord turned and looked at Peter, and that this brought the prediction to the latter's mind. The assumption evidently is that Jesus was also in the courtyard, for there is no trial in the high priest's house, as in Mark. According to v. 62 Peter then went out and wept bitterly; however, this verse is missing in some Old Latin texts and is probably written in here from Mt. 26:75. In vv. 63–65 Luke introduces the abuse of Jesus by servants, whereas Mk. 14:65 had put it in the trial scene and made the council members act in person.

When it becomes day, the Synedrium convenes (in its own proper gathering place), and Jesus is brought there. Luke leaves out the leading role taken by the high priest as well as that of the false witnesses. The Synedrium as such asks Jesus to tell them whether he is the Christ. Jesus replies that they would not believe him if he spoke, and would not answer him (if he asked for an explanation of his arrest) or release him (on proof that no legal ground existed for it). Instead of answering the question, therefore, he prophesies that from now on the Son of man will be seated at the right hand of God (Ps. 110: 1). They next ask him whether, then, he *is* the Son of God (the Messiah of Ps. 2:7)? Jesus replies, "You say that I am." (This *could* be an evasive answer, but is probably intended to be an admission in view of the fact that the Synedrium sees no need of hearing witnesses, and does not even pass a resolution. The admission of a claim of Messiahship was enough to incriminate him and warrant their going before Pilate.)

23:1 Jesus Delivered to Pilate (**Mk. 15:1; Mt. 27:1–2**), **cf. Jn. 18:28.** The whole gathering (Gr. *plēthos*) arises and takes Jesus to Pilate. No mention is made of his being bound.

23:2–5 The Trial before Pilate (**Mk. 15: 2–5; Mt. 27:11–14; cf. Jn. 18:29–38**). The charges brought by the Synedrium are expressly stated: they have found Jesus misleading their people (Gr. *éthnos*) and hindering the paying of taxes to Caesar (a misrepresentation of 20:25) and saying that he himself was Christ, a king (cf. 22: 67, 70 and 19:38). These grave accusations are not explored, as one might expect they would be (but cf. v. 14). Instead, Luke uses the question of Pilate and the answer of Jesus found in Mk. 15:2, and has Pilate declare "to the high priests and the crowds" (both suddenly present instead of the Synedrium) that he finds no guilt in this man. They, however, insist, saying that he was stirring up the people, teaching through all Judaea (Palestine, 1:5), beginning from Galilee in the north to this place (Jerusalem).

23:6–16 Jesus before Herod Antipas. Luke here injects a piece of his own special material. We have already noted that he knew of people who had been close to Herod. Hearing the mention of Galilee, Pilate now asks Jesus whether he is a Galilean, and learning that he is Herod Antipas' subject, sends him to the tetrarch, who was present in Jerusalem in those days (for the Passover). Herod is very glad to see Jesus. His desire to see him has already been mentioned in 9:9. He now hopes to see a miracle brought about through Jesus. He interrogated him in many words, but Jesus allegedly answers nothing. Herod's "many words" were certainly not mere chatter but an examination of the charges, and they ended in an opinion (cf. v. 15). The arrest had not, however, been made in his territory or on his initiative and he was no doubt most happy to pass the case back to Pilate. According to vv. 10–11, the high priests and scribes vehemently accuse Jesus, Herod and his courtiers treat him with contempt (in revenge for his silence), mock him by putting on him bright raiment (parallel of Mk. 15:17 f.?), and send him to Pilate. Allegedly Pilate and Herod from then on ended their previous hostility and became friends.

Thereupon Pilate calls together the high priests, the leaders (Gr. *árchontes;* meaning the Synedrium members, 18:18; 23:35; 24:20; cf. Acts 3:17) and "the people" (needed for v. 18; cf. Mk. 15:8 f.).

The procurator sums up the case before the (newly convened?) gathering: they have charged Jesus with turning the people away (from Caesar); he has investigated the matter in their presence (not described in vv. 1–7), but does not find this man guilty of anything they have adduced against him; Herod's opinion, too, was "behold nothing deserving of death was done by him." (The words "for he sent him back to us" are not too certain; Codex D reads "for I sent you to him"; the Sinaitic Syriac, "to whom I sent him.") Pilate now offers to chastise Jesus (to give them some satisfaction) and then to release him.

23:17–25 The Sentence of Death (Mk. 15:6–15; Mt. 27:15–26; cf. Jn. 18:38b–19:16). (The A.V. has v. 17 about Pilate's having to release someone at the feast, but it is missing in many mss.) The assumption is that no scourging was done, since the offer was rejected; in Mk. 15:9 Pilate asks whether they want him to release Jesus, and in 15:15 he actually has him scourged. Luke has eliminated the story about Barabbas (Mk. 15:6 ff.) with which Mark introduced the populace into the situation, but brings its substance parenthetically, after the people (without prompting by the high priests, as in Mark) ask to have that individual set free.

A second speech of Pilate, spoken for the purpose of effecting the liberation of Jesus, is mentioned in v. 20, but his words are not quoted as in Mk. 15:12; he is straightway given the crucifixion demand. Luke makes the next utterance of Pilate his *third* attempt to free Jesus. He supplements Mk. 15:14 with Pilate's declaration that he found no capital crime existing in Jesus' case, and with his renewed offer to chastise and then release him. Whereas Mark speaks only of further shouting to crucify Jesus, Luke speaks of people's besieging Pilate with loud cries, demanding his crucifixion, and he says that their cries prevailed. Pilate decreed that their request be granted. He released the man who had been cast into jail on account of uprising and murder, and whom they asked for, but Jesus he handed over to their will. Luke thus has relieved Pilate and the Roman soldiers of all brutality. That he acceded to the will of the Jewish people, after stating his opinion of Jesus' innocence, was quite understandable to Western readers, for whom democracy had more meaning than for Orientals.

23:26–32 On the Way to Calvary (Mk. 15:21; Mt. 27:32; Jn. 19:17). Luke leaves out the mockery of the Roman soldiers and their leading Jesus out to crucify him (Mk. 15:16–21); one has the impression that Jesus was handed over to the Jews (v. 25). Following Mark he relates how Simon of Cyrene was forced to bear the cross "after (i.e., behind) Jesus" (allusion to 9:23?), but he drops the names of this Simon's sons, who were of no interest to his readers.

In vv. 27–32 Luke introduces some of his special material. A big crowd of people and especially of women, who bewailed Jesus and wept, were in the procession. Jesus turned, and addressing them as "daughters of Jerusalem" (Song of Sol. 1:5), bade them not weep for him but rather for themselves and their children. He prophesied that days would come in which they would count as blessed those that never had borne children. At that time they would quote Hos. 10:8, longing for quick death. For if they do these things to green wood, what will happen to the dry wood? (Cf. Ezek. 20:47, Prov. 11:31. If the innocent are dealt with thus how will the hardened sinners fare?) "Two other evildoers" were led out "to be done away with him." (In Mark they are called "robbers" and are not mentioned until later.)

23:33–43 The Crucifixion (Mk. 15:22–32; Mt. 27:33–43; Jn. 19:18–24). Luke does not give the Aramaic name of the place of execution, but calls it *kraníon,* "skull." It is significant, however, that Greek-speaking congregations wanted and had a name for this locality. Luke omits both the offer of wine mixed with myrrh and the hour of the crucifixion. He records the crucifixion of the evildoers immediately after that of Jesus. Jesus' prayer, "Father forgive them, etc." (v. 34a) is missing in such an important manuscript as Codex B, as well as in Codex D and the Old Syriac version. Perhaps it has been introduced from some lost Gospel. Its preservation may be due to the desire to show another instance of Scripture fulfillment ("he made intercession for the transgressors," Is. 53:12). The division of the garments follows Mark's account, but it is not clear that soldiers did the dividing. Luke notes that the people stood by watching. The scoffing of the passers-by, with the saying about the Temple (Mk. 15:29–30), is omitted. The "leaders" scoff in place of the high priests and scribes of Mk. 15:31–32, but instead of saying "he cannot save himself," they say "let him save himself"; the phrase "the Christ, the king of Israel" is changed to "the Christ of God, the chosen One." Luke adds that the soldiers (whose Roman nationality is not directly stated) also mocked him, saying, when they drew near and brought him vinegar (for refreshment), that if he were king of the Jews (v. 3) he should save himself. The inscription on the cross "above him" is given as: THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

In vv. 39 ff. Luke adds special material. Mark had written that those crucified with Jesus reviled him. Luke corrects this: *One* of the evildoers *blasphemed* him (the divine Lord), asking (ironically) if he were not the Christ, and suggesting he save himself and them. But the other rebuked him, "Dost thou not fear God, because thou art under the same verdict? And we justly (are condemned). For we are receiving things worthy of what we did. But this one did nothing out of place." (Hence Jesus' claim of being the Christ must be true; he is the innocent sufferer of Is. 53.) Addressing Jesus by name, he prays, "Remember me when thou comest with thy kingdom." (Codex B: "into thy kingdom" tries to harmonize this with v. 43; Codex D: "on the day of thy coming" paraphrases correctly). Jesus replies, "Amen I say unto thee, today thou wilt be with me in Paradise" (the "Garden of Eden" of the rabbinic texts). The intermediate state is apparently lost sight of here as in 16:23. In this case the explanation may be different. With the postponement of the apocalyptic events some compromise was evidently made in certain quarters with the thought of immediate bliss for the righteous.

23:44–49 The Death of Jesus (**Mk. 15: 33–41; Mt. 27:45–56; Jn. 19:25–37**). Luke follows Mark, but declares that the sun suffered an eclipse (which, however, may merely be an inference from Mark's "darkness"), and along with this mentions the rending of the curtain of the Temple, adding: *through the middle.* He leaves out the Ps. 22:2 utterance of Jesus, and the misunderstanding of it. For the death-cry he substitutes the call, "Father into (the care of) thy hands I place my spirit" (Ps. 31:6). The centurion of Mark is retained, but he is said to have praised God, saying: "In truth this man was a righteous one" (cf. 1:17; a much weaker testimonial than in Mark's version). Luke then brings in the crowds (cf. 23:27, 35) that had come to this spectacle (of the crucifixion). Having seen what happened (i.e., the eclipse and the rending of the curtain), they smote their breasts (in repentance, 18:13)—a surprisingly different reaction than one would expect after 23:13, 18—and went home. Luke now relates that all those acquainted with him (2:44, excluding relatives) and the women who followed him from Galilee (their names are left out because given in 8:2–3 and differing from those mentioned by Mark), stood from afar and saw these things. As Luke has suppressed the flight of the disciples (Mk. 14:50), they certainly ought to have been included among the witnesses. (In Jn. this glory is reserved for the beloved disciple, who with three women stands beneath the cross.)

23:50–56 The Burial of Jesus (**Mk. 15: 42–47; Mt. 27:57–61; cf. Jn. 19:38–42**). That it was near evening, when a Sabbath was about to begin, is left out here by Luke and put later in v. 54. He gives Mark's facts about Joseph of Arimathea, adding that he was a good and righteous man and had not consented to their (the council's) decision and action. The calling in of the centurion (Mk. 15:44–45) is omitted. Joseph does not buy the fine linen, as in Mark; he is imagined as having it on hand. He puts the body in a sepulchre (made of hewn stones? or rock-hewn? Mk.'s definite language is avoided) in which no one had as yet been buried. (It was naturally Joseph's own, cf. Mt. 27:60; rich men prepared their tombs in advance). Luke omits the placing of a stone before the entrance, though his Easter story makes reference to it (24:2). The Galilean women followed (Joseph as he bore the body to the sepulchre); they saw the sepulchre, and how Jesus' body was laid. Instead of deferring the preparation (implying purchase) of spices until after the Sabbath (Mk. 16:1), Luke has the women prepare spices and myrrh on their return. Thereupon they rested on the Sabbath, according to the Commandment.

THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE

24:1–53 (Mk. 16; Mt. 28; cf. Jn. 20–21)

24:1–11 The Empty Tomb (Mk. 16:1–8; Mt. 28:1–10; cf. Jn. 20:1–18). Luke, unlike Mark, does not begin afresh here, but runs on in continuity with the preceding. On the first of the Sabbaths (the days of the week; cf. 1 Cor. 16:2) in the deep dawn (i.e., the very start of dawn; Mk.: "as the sun was going up") they (i.e., the women of 23:55 ff.) came to the tomb, bearing the spices they had prepared. They found the stone (the moving of which evidently did not trouble them, as it had, according to Mk.) rolled away. They did not, as in Mk., see a young man sitting inside the tomb on the right; the simple fact is registered that they did not find the body. The present text speaks of their "entering" the tomb, but that word is suspect, since nothing is said of their egress, cf. Mk. 16:8, and since Luke, according to 8:2–3, 23:55, imagines the women as numerous. When they were perplexed about this, two men in shining garb stood by them (cf. 2:9, Acts 1:10)—evidently outside the tomb. (Luke thus increases Mark's one youth to two men, as more befitting the dignity of the occasion. This may have led him to abandon the localization of the incident inside the tomb where the situation would be cramped.) The women were filled with fear and lowered their faces (eyes) to the earth. The men, unlike the youth in Mark, did not reassure them, nor state that they had come to seek Jesus the crucified, but rather, asked, "Why do you seek the living with the dead?" (This seems to disagree with the idea of 23:53, cf. Mt. 27:60, that the tomb had not been used before.) Only the words "he is not here, but is raised up" (omitted in Codex D) remind one of Mark, though the order is inverted. The invitation to see the empty resting place is omitted. But Luke's prime concern is to modify the command of the angel in Mk. 16:7 that they bear a message to Jesus' disciples and (especially) to Peter that Jesus is preceding them to Galilee where they will see him, as he had said to them. For Luke has the idea that the disciples stayed at Jerusalem and that all the appearances of the risen Lord took place thereabouts. That presumably had become the official theory of the Christian Church that was re-established on the ruins of the Holy City sometime after the Jewish war of A.D. 68–70. Luke changes the words to: "Remember what he said to you *while he was still in Galilee.*" Thus what the angel sought to do was to awaken faith on the part of the disciples by reminding them of Jesus' previous prediction of his own fate: "The Son of man must be betrayed into the hands of sinners and be crucified and arise on the third day." (The predictions in 9:22, 44; 18:33 agree in substance.) The women now recalled Jesus' words (though they were not described as present at any of the Passion predictions). There thus is no need of fear and trembling on their part, as in Mark. Instead of fleeing and saying nothing to anyone (Mk. 16:8), they returned and announced all these things to "the eleven and all the rest."

In v. 10 there is appended a statement, the final words of which duplicate v. 9 but have a different specification about those to whom the message was brought: "the Apostles." Luke—or an editor?—included it because it gave the names of the women. Mary Magdalene holds her place; Mark's Mary of James drops out; Joanna (8:3) is substituted for Salome; a significant "and the rest with them" is added. But what the women reported appeared "to the eleven and the rest" as mere words, and the women were not believed. This "doubt motif," which seemingly puts the disciples who had heard the Passion and resurrection predictions in a bad light, serves a useful purpose. It makes necessary personal visions, which would have been superfluous had the disciples believed: It showed Luke's reader that the Apostles were skeptical men who had to be persuaded against their will of the truth of the resurrection.

V. 12 of the received text (A.V.), referring to Peter's running out to the tomb, is missing in Codex D and the Old Latin witnesses, and must be regarded as spurious (drawn from Jn. 20:4–6). It was probably added to effect a harmonization of v. 11 with 24:24, and by its concluding words, "he went home wondering at what had happened," to set the stage for an appearance of Jesus to Peter on the way, or at any rate while separated from the others (v. 34).

The Lucan narrative of the empty tomb is merely a revision of that of Mark, and does not exhibit any better knowledge. It provides an instructive example of how one writer may alter what was written by another. If we did not have Mark's text we could never guess that drastic changes had been made.

Mark had not told anything beyond 16:8, and so whatever else was to be said about the resurrection of Jesus had to be gathered independently. This both Luke and Matthew do in their own way.

Luke's Continuation
24:13–53

24:13–35 The Emmaus Disciples. Luke adduces a story for which he prepared the way by his allusion to "the Eleven *and all the rest*" in v. 9. For the two men of this story were not members of the "eleven." They go out (for no discernible reason) to Emmaus, which is described as a village "sixty stadia" (7 miles) from Jerusalem. Emmaus (later called Nicopolis) was a well-known city which had been destroyed by Varus (Jos., *Ant., 17,* 10, 9), and so perhaps was only a village in this period. Codex S corrects the distance to "one hundred and sixty stadia" to establish agreement with the facts of geography. (Those who would rely on the sixty stadia seek the Gospel Emmaus at *el Kubēbeh.*) Luke's geographical ideas about Palestine are hazy, and if he wrote "sixty" that can carry no weight comparable to that of the distinctive name (a Semitic Hammath, which means "Warm Springs" such as actually exist at Emmaus—*'Amwās*). The allusion to Emmaus may be an important indication of the origin of this story (cf. p. 260).

The two disciples, who were not only talking but arguing about recent happenings, were joined on the way by Jesus himself. They failed to recognize him because their eyes were held closed (figuratively speaking), i.e., by a higher power. Luke's Hellenistic readers were familiar with stories of gods appearing in human form (cf. "in another form," Mk. 16:12) and associating with men, and the Old Testament presupposes the same thing of angels (Gen. 18–19; Judg. 6, 13). The tradition from which the story is derived thus used ideas and conceptions attractive to the ancient mind.

When Jesus inquired about the subject of their conversation, the pair stood still with sorrowful mien. But one, named Cleopas (short for Cleopatros) asked him if he were sojourning alone (i.e., in isolated circumstances) at Jerusalem, that he did not know what had recently transpired there. In response to a request for information, Cleopas continued: the things of Jesus the Nazarene, who became a "prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people" (the latter are thus imagined as friendly to Jesus, as in 23:48) and who they themselves had hoped would redeem Israel, i.e., be the Messiah. (The limited idea of Jesus' nature revealed here is an archaic element in this narrative, indicative of ideas prevailing in the quarter from which it came.) But the high priests and "leaders" (18:18; 23:13, 35) had delivered him up to punishment of death and crucified him. Besides all this, it was (now) the third day since these things (i.e., the Passion) had happened (unexpectedly; the original storyteller whose narrative Luke here adopted did not know of the Passion predictions of 9:22, 44; 18:31 f. cf. v. 6–8). But some women of their group had startled them that morning with the report that, when at the tomb, they had seen a vision of angels (pl., conforming with 24:4), who said he was alive. And some of their number had gone out to the tomb, finding it as the women had said, but him they did not see. (This was not related by Luke, and led to the interpolation of 24:12.)

Jesus then rebuked them as lacking in understanding and as being slow of heart (mind) to believe all that the prophets had spoken (about the Messiah). Was it not necessary for the Messiah to suffer these things in order to enter into his glory? Beginning from Moses (i.e., the Pentateuch) and (continuing with) all the Prophets (which for the Jews started with the Book of Joshua), he interpreted to them the things concerning himself in all the Scriptures.

They now neared their objective, and he made as if to go farther. But they urged him to stay with them because it was toward evening and the day was already ending (9:12). (It remains unexplained how they could have accommodations and privacy there.) When he reclined with them (to eat), he took the bread, gave thanks, and breaking it gave it to them (allusion to the Eucharist?). At that moment their eyes were opened (by the higher power that had held them closed thus far), and they recognized him. But he disappeared (and so became separated) from them (cf. Judg. 6:21–22; 13:20–21). Then they spoke to each other of how their hearts had burned in them (i.e., been deeply affected) on the way, when he opened the Scriptures to them. Some would assume "hearts burning" to be a mistranslation of Aram. "heavy of heart," as rendered by the Old Syriac, but this gives a wrong nuance. The phrase is equivalent to a Hebrew one in Gen. 43:30; 1 Kings 3:6. They rose up in that hour (giving up the idea of spending the night at Emmaus) and hurried back to Jerusalem, a five-hour walk if Emmaus is localized at Nicopolis. They came to the eleven "and those that were with them" (a tie-in with 24:8) *and were hailed with the news that the Lord had indeed risen and had appeared to Simon.* (It is unexplained when, where and how this took place; as pointed out above, the interpolated v. 12 sought to provide help.) They related their own experience and how they had recognized Jesus at the moment when he broke the bread.

It seems probable that this story originally did not contain the italicized element (v. 34). Luke evidently worked it in on historical grounds—because he still knew Christ had first appeared to Peter (1 Cor. 15:5). But the intent of this story was to set forth how two men who did not belong to the inner circle of the Eleven had first seen the Lord. This went counter to Luke's idea of exalting the Apostles. But since the Lord could hardly have appeared to Simon before the pair left Jerusalem without their knowing of it and since an appearance to him during their return walk from Emmaus would still rob Simon of his first place, the injection of this item is clearly artificial. And why should the disciples after v. 34 react to the subsequent appearance of Jesus in the surprised manner of v. 36? (In Mk. 16:13 it is assumed that they disbelieved the Emmaus disciples, as they had Mary Magdalene, and the appearance to Simon has been canceled.)

That the story of the Emmaus disciples has to be classified as a legend seems clear. Paul knows nothing of it in 1 Cor. 15, so it must have emerged later. It is an independent entity, and therefore all the discussions about the location of Emmaus based on the time element and the sequence of 24:36 f. are futile. But a legend usually has a purpose. In this case, such a one is revealed by the two names—Cleopas and Emmaus. It served both a personal and a local objective. Cleopas is evidently identical with Clopas of Jn. 19:25, who according to reports preserved by Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist., 3,* 11) was the father of Simon, the "bishop" of the church re-established at Jerusalem after A.D. 70. This Simon, who was martyred under Trajan, was clearly the head of the Jerusalem church at the time when Luke wrote. Naturally the resurrection experience of this man's father would have been of great interest at that very time. Simon, son of Clopas, is said to have been one of the Lord's kinsmen, the *despósunoi* (cf. p. 119). With the church at Jerusalem under the aegis of the kinsmen, Peter's vision of Christ no longer had the same interest that it had had in Paul's time. The vision of Jesus' brother James (1 Cor. 15:7), which no doubt had held the stage there in the period of the latter's leadership, may still have been important, but Luke has chosen to ignore it, just as he has the martyrdom of this "pillar" (Gal. 2:9).

The mention of Emmaus is a second important element indicative of the legend's origin. The story was no doubt attached to the house where Jesus broke bread with the disciples. Such legends of sacred places, however, arise to explain why they are sacred. We here have the cult legend of an early Christian church at Emmaus. Perhaps this congregation existed before the war of 68–70, and was instrumental subsequently in re-establishing the church at Jerusalem. Or Christian fugitives from Jerusalem may have been assigned a place of settlement at Emmaus by the Romans, just as Pharisaic Jews received such at Lydda and Yamnia. From there they may have made pilgrimages to Jerusalem. In any case, Emmaus was in the Jerusalem "diocese," when this story was received by Luke.

24:36–49 Appearance of Jesus to the Eleven. This story has been loosely joined with the preceding by "as they were saying this." But originally it was independent. It seems unnecessary for Jesus to appear first to the Emmaus disciples and then to the eleven, with the former present too. Furthermore, the psychology of v. 37 is out of line with that presupposed in vv. 33–34; the disciples are startled and frightened, as though no appearances of Christ had preceded. This incident, however, is much more firmly rooted in tradition than the preceding story, for Paul mentions the appearance before the Twelve (the eleven) immediately after the appearance to Cephas, i.e., Simon Peter (1 Cor. 15:5). It is foreseen in Mk. 16:7 and is related in diverse ways in Mt. 28:16 ff., Jn. 20:19 ff. and Mk. 16:14 ff. It was really the one of cardinal importance, for the resurrection faith could not have rested wholly on Peter's experience. But it no doubt took place in Galilee and has been transferred secondarily by Luke, as by John, to the Jerusalem scene.

vv. 36–40 The disciples are frightened at the appearance of Jesus and think they see a ghost (Mk. 6:49). He asks them why they are terrified and why (such) thoughts arise in their hearts (transl. of Aram. idiom). He bids them see by his hands and feet (cf. Jn. 20:20, 25 f.) that it is he himself. He even invites them to touch him and see that a ghost has no flesh and bone such as he has. (This is a peculiar way of putting the matter. One would expect: see that he is no ghost, because he has flesh and bone.) The received text (cf. A.V.) has a v. 40 here, stating that he showed them his hands and his feet; but it is missing in Codex D, the Old Syriac, and other authorities, and is perhaps based on Jn. 20:20.

vv. 41–43 The disciples apparently did not accept the invitation to touch Jesus. Their psychological state is described rather peculiarly in the words: "While they were still unbelieving *from joy* and were wondering." Perhaps "from joy" was glossed into the text on the basis of Jn. 20:20. Jesus then asks whether they have any food. When they give him a portion of baked fish (Old Syriac and Old Latin add: "and honeycomb"), he takes it and eats it in their presence. (In 24:31 he disappeared after breaking the bread.) The allusion to baked fish suggests that the story of the appearance to the Eleven was originally localized in Galilee. And indeed it was there that the Apostles were to see Jesus according to Mk. 16:7. In Jn. 21:9 f., where fish are also mentioned (but no eating by Jesus), we have a different account of what may be the same vision in the original Galilean setting. After the culminating proof of his being alive, given by his eating, the disciples were of course fully persuaded—so much so that Luke does not find it necessary to mention it.

vv. 44–48 There follows instruction by Jesus, reminding the disciples of his words which he had spoken to them "when he was still with them." Those words were that all things had to be fulfilled that were written concerning himself in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. (Mention of the Psalms suggests that the third division of the Hebrew canon, "The Writings," to which the Psalms belong, was as yet incomplete.) He thereupon opened their mind (Gr. *nūs;* Acts 16:14 the heart) to understand the Scriptures. And he said to them that "thus it is written that the Christ suffers and rises from the dead on the third day." (This parallels vv. 26–27 in the story of the Emmaus disciples, but is put positively, not as a question.) Thereupon (v. 47) he gives them their task. The words of v. 47 do not depend grammatically on "thus it is written," but rather are to be taken in the sense of a Semitic "jussive" (Eng.: future tense phrase, expressing determination), "And repentance unto the forgiveness of sins (cf. Mk. 1:4) shall be preached in his name to all nations beginning from Jerusalem" (the message is thus essentially that of John the Baptist, minus the baptism, 3:3). They are (i.e., will be) witnesses to men of these things (i.e., of Christ's death and resurrection on which the call to repentance in his name rests). He is sending forth upon them the promise of his father (Codex D: "my promise"), i.e., the promised Holy Spirit of Joel 2:28 (cf. Acts 1:4; 2:33). They are commanded to stay in the city until they are clothed with power (emanating from this Holy Spirit; Acts 1:8) from on high (cf. 1:78—from God). (In Jn. 20:21 f. Jesus gives them this power immediately.) Matthew believed in the enduring presence of Christ; Luke removes him from the earthly scene and leaves that scene to an intermediary, the Holy Spirit.

Luke thus has accepted the late idea, no doubt promulgated in the re-established Jerusalem church of his day, that all appearances of Christ occurred in Judaea—Emmaus still having a claim to consideration besides Jerusalem. In Jn. 20 the Jerusalem scene alone remains. (In Mk. 16:20 Emmaus has been lost sight of.) It was at Jerusalem that the Apostles received power and from there they went forth.

It is a historical riddle how the remembrance of the original Galilean locale of the first appearances of the risen Christ could be wiped out. One may opine that Galilee no longer needed to be considered when Luke wrote; perhaps in the aftermath of the war, A.D. 68–70, Christian people had been expelled from there. In Acts, too, there is no mention of congregations in Galilee. Thus a whole chapter of Christian beginnings has been consigned to oblivion.

24:50–53 The Ascension (Acts 1:3–14; cf. Mt. 28:16–20; Jn. 20:19–23). Having given them his last directives, Jesus leads them (the eleven and those with them? v. 33) toward Bethany. (It is doubtful whether the mention of Bethany is original here; in Acts 1:12, Olivet is the scene of the parting.) He lifted up his hands (Lev. 9:22) and blessed them (cf. his blessing the children, Mk. 10:16; but the farewell idea is involved here, as in Gen. 49:28). "And it came to pass when he blessed them that he separated from them [and was carried up into heaven]." The bracketed words are missing in some authorities, notably in Codices S and D. Some think that their omission is due only to a desire to harmonize the contradictory reports of an immediate ascension and of one after forty days (Acts 1:3) by construing this parting as temporary. But it is more probable that the shorter text, which the Old Syriac confirms, even though it changes the word "separated" to "was taken up," is original.

Luke's Gospel version portraying this as a final parting in connection with the appearance of vv. 36 ff., must be taken as representing an earlier theory than the one in Acts 1:3. We may note, too, that it is paralleled in Mt. 28:16 ff. After the present ascension phrase some manuscripts, notably Codices B and S, add "as they worshiped him," but the words are probably a gloss made on the basis of Mt. 28:17.

After the parting, the disciples returned to Jerusalem with great joy (cf. already v. 41), and were continually in the Temple, praising God (cf. Acts 2:46, 3:1, 5:42). Luke has the old ideal of pious Judaism in mind here, which is set forth so vividly in the stories of chs. 1–2.

The relation of the conclusion of Luke to the beginning of Acts may be left for discussion in connection with the latter work. Here as well as there the risen Lord is imagined restored to physical existence and even eating food (Acts 10:41 also speaks of his drinking), while at the same time able to appear and disappear. The narrator thus yields to a materialistic view of the resurrected body to a greater degree than any other New Testament writer except John. But the real resurrection visions outlined for us several generations earlier by Paul (1 Cor. 15:4–8) must have been of a different order. We come closest to them in Paul's reflections about immortality, in connection with which he relates them, since he imagines the believer's future state to be like that of the risen Christ. Luke has accepted grosser ideas, which effectively met the charge of skeptics that the disciples had seen a ghost (v. 39). Creeds and rituals have perpetuated this conception of a resurrection of the flesh, which runs contrary to Jesus' own teaching (20:36).

Luke gave his readers a book intended to supplant others—notably Mark and Q. It is instructive to observe how, with all his dependence on them, Luke omits and abridges, enlarges and changes or points up differently in amazing freedom—bringing the ancient gospel story and the teachings of Jesus to the people of his time and place. Because the book was well received and made canonical, it has continued to instruct, comfort, and inspire Christendom of all time.

The Gospel according to John

The Different Gospel

That the Fourth Gospel differs greatly from the Synoptics is apparent. This was observed already by the ancients. To explain the difference on the historical side, Eusebius puts forward the idea that the evangelist wrote mainly about the period in which Jesus carried on a synchronous ministry with John the Baptist, whereas the others take up the story after the latter's incarceration (Mk. 1:14). He bids readers keep this firmly in mind, assuring them that then they will not find John disagreeing with the other Gospels. He then declares that John omitted telling about the birth of Christ because this was taken care of by Matthew and Luke, but that he made a beginning with the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, the presentation of which had been reserved for him by the Divine Spirit, as for one greater than they (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 24). Clement, less doctrinaire than Eusebius, is quoted in a later passage as saying that John had seen that all which was human in the Lord had been treated of in detail by the other Gospels; therefore, encouraged by his friends and moved by the Spirit, he composed a spiritual Gospel (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 6,* 14).

While these observations cannot satisfy us today, they show that there must have been debate about this Gospel, in view of its departure from the type of material found in the earlier ones, before it gained general acceptance. This is confirmed by the fact that other early Christian writings show no influence received from it. It was only when its usefulness both in combating heresy and in supporting an advanced Christology were recognized that it came to the fore. In the age in which Eusebius lived, it was so valuable that he can characterize it as well known in the churches throughout the world. He apologizes for its holding fourth place (instead of first) on the ground of its being written last and being climactic.

The Authorship Tradition

We do not know if the author gave this book a title—in the absence of one the opening words commonly served as such—but if he did, "gospel" was no part of it, for that is a term he does not use at all. It is unlikely, too, that his name appeared in any title, for his identity is not even revealed by the editorial hand that wrote the concluding verses. In the Book of Revelation (1:1; 22:8) there is assertion of authorship by a man named John, who clearly is at home in western Asia Minor. Whether the churchmen who brought the Gospel into public use and called it "according to John" connected it with John of Revelation or with another John is the question. Their act of so designating it antedates all recorded tradition. The latter begins only around the end of the second century. The Canon Muratori (*c.* 200), giving an opinion then held in Italy, states:

> The fourth of the Gospels is by John, one of the disciples. At the urging of his fellow disciples and bishops he said, "Fast with me for three days, and whatever shall have been revealed to any one of us let us tell it to one another." The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should write an account of all things in his own name, all the rest endorsing (it).*

That Andrew rather than Peter is brought to the fore in this tradition suggests Asia Minor origin. Its purpose is to give the Gospel the imprimatur of all the Apostles. It assumes John to be one of the Twelve—hence the son of Zebedee, the only one of that name in the group.

In writing a letter to Bishop Victor of Rome about this time, Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus refers to the "great lights" (cf. Jn. 5:35) that rest in the province of Asia, and among them mentions John, the beloved disciple, who is buried at Ephesus (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 31). This probably assumes authorship of the Gospel by this John. The most vigorous early proponent of Johannine authorship is Irenaeus. As a boy he allegedly had heard Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna tell of his association with John and others who had seen the Lord, and had heard him quote what they had said (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 5,* 23).

But the boy Irenaeus may have been mistaken about the association of Polycarp with John and other eyewitnesses of the Lord, or his memory had confused matters. For when he asserts that a friend of Polycarp, Bishop Papias of Hierapolis, was a direct disciple of John (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 39), Eusebius refutes him. He says that Papias himself in his Introduction to his work, to which Eusebius evidently had access, reveals that he was no eye or ear witness of the Holy Apostles, but only claims to have received the Christian teachings from their *friends.* Papias was especially zealous in making inquiries wherever he met anyone who had known the elders (= here the Apostles) to learn what such a one had heard from them (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 29).

> What did Andrew or what did Peter say, or what did Philip or what did Thomas or what did James or what did John or Matthew or another of the disciples of the Lord say? Or what do Aristion and the Elder John, disciples of the Lord, say?

In commenting on this, Eusebius notes that two men named John are mentioned, and that the second or "Elder John" is coupled with Aristion and stands outside the group of the Twelve Apostles. He infers: (1) that there had actually been two Johns at Ephesus (the Apostle and "the Elder"); (2) that one may ascribe the authorship of the Book of Revelation to the second mentioned, if one will not accept its authorship by the first (whom he regards as the son of Zebedee and author of the Gospel); (3) that Papias claims to have heard only Aristion and "the Elder" John. Eusebius adds with some uncertainty: "At least he quotes them frequently by name and gives their traditions in his writings."

But Eusebius has evidently overlooked what Papias said about John the son of Zebedee. According to a quotation from Papias' second book, preserved by Byzantine writers, James and his brother John were slain by the Jews. If that be dependable, it completely invalidates the authorship of the Fourth Gospel by the Apostle. It agrees with what is implied in Mk. 10:39, where Jesus predicts that the sons of Zebedee will drink the cup which he himself is drinking (i.e., suffer martyrdom). Apologists argue that Papias merely inferred the martyrdom of John from this prediction of Jesus. They are willing to make Jesus a poor prophet to save the Johannine authorship. But such predictions as that of Mk. 10:39 are too specific to be historical; they must be viewed as formulated in the light of what had actually happened. When Mark wrote these words both James and John had suffered martyrdom. While this was lost sight of in the West, where only the martyrdom of James was reported (Acts 12:2), it was remembered in the East. Thus the Syriac writer Aphraates (A.D. 344) states in his 21st Homily that there were only two apostolic martyrs apart from Stephen, Peter, and Paul: namely, James and John. A Syriac martyrology of the year 411 gives the 27th of December as the day of commemorating the martyrdom of "John and James, the apostles, in Jerusalem." Had the son of Zebedee lived at Ephesus in the last decade of the first century, it is simply inconceivable that Ignatius, passing through this area only a few years later (*c.* 110–115), should not have mentioned him in his letters to the local churches. If the Anti-Montanists like the Alogi of Asia Minor (*c.* 170) attributed the Gospel of John to the Gnostic Cerinthus, this indicates that its authorship was not so firmly established as to make such a claim impossible. It therefore is not ill-will or hypercriticism but a facing of facts that leads scholars to throw doubt on the authorship tradition.

---

* Tr. of R. M. Grant, *Second Century Christianity.* (See Bibliography.)

The Beloved Disciple

Tradition being unreliable, one can only rely on examination of the book itself. But does it not claim that the beloved disciple is the author? That assertion is apparently made in 21:24, following as it does 21:20–23. Who then is the beloved disciple? It is a question whether one can derive help from the list of the disciples appearing in 21:2 to ascertain his identity. As there are two unnamed disciples in the group, no certainty could be arrived at on that basis in any case. One may of course argue on general historical grounds that the only rivals of Peter and Andrew were James and John (Mk. 1:19, 10:35 f.), and say quite justifiably that one of them is the appropriate counterpart of Peter. John evidently attained a special importance in the Primitive Church (Gal. 2:9; cf. Acts 8:14). It would be a continuation of rivalry between Peter and John if the Gospel represented John as the beloved disciple, while at the same time conceding the primacy to Peter.

On the other hand, one can argue that 18:15 rules out this disciple's identity with John. How would the fisherman of Capernaum (Mk. 1:19) have been known to the high priest and have enjoyed privilege of access to his house? For this reason other candidates for identification with the beloved disciple have been suggested, e.g., Lazarus, of whom it is said, "He whom thou lovest is ill" (11:3). It is possible, furthermore, and favored by some leading scholars, to regard the beloved disciple as a purely symbolical figure. To accept realistically the idea that Jesus loved one disciple more than another is not only without warrant from the side of the Synoptic Gospels but such favoritism accords ill with the divine Christ this Gospel proclaims. The objection falls to the ground if he embodies the ideal of a disciple in the estimation of the writer. Once one entertains the idea of historical fiction in this matter, one can revert, if one desires, to the thought that the beloved disciple is really meant to be an idealized John, the son of Zebedee. In view of the great amount of pseudonymous writing that was done in those days one should not attach too much weight to the testimony of 21:24. Even a classical author like Xenophon masqueraded as a philosophically inclined youth, Theopompus Athenaeus (*Anabasis, 2,* 1, 12). The avoidance of identification of the beloved disciple in the Gospel strengthens the belief that the author does not quite dare name this figure, because any identification could have been disproved. If he was fictionalizing, so far as this figure is concerned, he may have counted on intriguing his readers with this mystery —a purpose he certainly achieved.

The Unity of the Gospel

The book is composed throughout in a style as distinctive as that of the Deuteronomist of the Old Testament. It is therefore not a mosaic of traditional materials to such a degree as the Synoptics, but a more molded product, pervaded by the spirit and thought of an author or of his group. There are, however, structural disturbances. A first critical observation flows from the ancient manuscripts themselves; it is that the story of the adulteress 8:53–9:11 originally was no part of this production. In the second place, one must note that the Gospel has two conclusions, 20:30 f. and 21:24–25. This leads some to the theory that a later editor added ch. 21, while others argue that the author himself provided it, except for the last two verses. In this connection it is worthy of note that the later conclusion to Mk. (16:9–20) written about the middle of the second century, uses Jn. 20 but not ch. 21 in its resumé of the Easter appearances. John must thus have circulated for a time without the appendix. A third critical observation to be made is that chs. 14–17 must have been interpolated after 13:38. Since the interpolated material is composed in the same style, there is reason to believe that the author himself is responsible for this expansion of his Gospel.

Some scholars hold that a few minor additions were made by editorial hands for dogmatic reasons: (1) in the interest of sacramentalism, 6:51b–58 and 19: 34b–35; (2) in the interest of the older eschatology, 5:28–29; 6:39, 40, 44; 12:48; for the author otherwise views the present in eschatological terms (5:25 f.; cf. 3:18 f.; 4:23; 9:39; 11:25 f.).

Another question agitating scholars is whether the Gospel has become disarranged. While that could not happen easily with scrolls, it was readily possible with leaves when the codex form of manuscript was used. (This was done already in the second century.) The position of ch. 6 after ch. 5 seems unnatural. In ch. 5 Jesus is in Jerusalem and in 6 he goes to the other side of the lake of Galilee. If the order is reversed, matters become clearer. But there are apparently also blocks of material (such as 7:15–24, 10:19–21, 10:22–30) that have been put in a different position than that for which they were first composed. Some scholars believe that a discourse on Light was eliminated and its pieces distributed. But the thing that counts is the final form of a production. It is enough to note where there are such pieces that betray artificiality of placement, or are in some way discordant in their present environment, or are related to a different one. The hypothetical explanations of such phenomena are the subject of learned debate, in which, in the nature of the case, no certainty is obtainable.

The Sources of the Gospel

When it was believed that John the son of Zebedee wrote the Gospel, there was no need of looking for sources, for that Apostle could have written freehandedly of what he had seen and heard. But by all standards of historical investigation, John's narrative is less close to the true facts than those of the Synoptics. Anyone who is not directly or remotely inhibited by the Inspiration-dogma can discern that the author relates things that never could have happened (2:1–11; 6:1–14, 16–21; 11:38–44; 19:34). He was thus far removed from the events and dependent on sources. Can anything be said of these?

Some portions of his narrative, in spite of all divergences, show a relationship to the traditions reported by the Synoptics. This is true especially of the sections on John the Baptist in ch. 1; the cleansing of the Temple, 2:13–22; the Galilean ministry in 2:12; 4:43–54; 6:1–7:9; the Passion narrative and the post-resurrection stories. For the stories of the seven miracles, which are viewed as signs (Gr. *sēmeía*), a current theory holds that the author drew on an earlier book of signs. (Cf. especially 20:30 f., which might have been its conclusion.) In favor of this it may be said that two are labeled "first" and "second" (2:11, 4:54), whereas other passages think of Jesus as doing many signs (2:23, 4:45, 12:37). But since the numeration is not continued for the signs of chs. 5, 6, 9 and 11, it remains doubtful whether these should be ascribed to a single source. When one deducts the peculiarly Johannine elements from these narratives, they appear to be of diverse character and may well have been gathered from various quarters.

For the sayings of Jesus, the author has constructed lengthy discourses, a number of them occasioned by the sign-incidents, and these differ greatly from those of the Synoptic Jesus (even though they contain some parallels to Synoptic sayings, cf. 2:19; 4:44; 12:25–26; 13:16, 20; 15:20). They presuppose a different milieu on the part of the author and his group, which present-day research is eagerly seeking to determine. One may well exploit the claim of 1:35 f. that the first disciples of Jesus came from the circle around John the Baptist as indicating that this is true of the author of the book and of his group. In contrast to the Synoptics, whose ultimate Jewish background is Pharisaic Judaism, he evidently came out of a sectarian Judaism in some respects like that of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect, but even more influenced by a kind of Gnosticism such as is found in the Hermetic literature, as well as in that of the sect of the Mandeans, for the Scrolls sect did not have the redeemer-idea, but only that of a future king.

The Influence of Gnosis

Gnosis or Gnosticism, it is now realized, existed before Christianity. It was the quest of probing more deeply into the mysteries of the present world order, which was pessimistically regarded as evil, and of finding redemption from it for the imprisoned human soul. Gnosis made use of mythological ideas. An important early form of it employed the myth of a heavenly messenger who comes to earth, takes on human form and declares the way of redemption to men. He then returns to heaven, to which destination his converts follow after death. The sources illustrating this unfortunately are of a slightly later date than the Gospel. There is no likelihood, however, of the Hermetic writings, notably the tract called *Poimandres,* having been influenced by Christian documents. They represent a stream of thought that had flowed independently for a long time and affected the Jew Philo as well. They thus may be used legitimately in reconstructing the background of this Gospel.

The gnostic-messenger discourse has three notable characteristics: (1) "I am" declarations, giving self-characterizations of the revealer; (2) invitations or calls to listeners, generally combined with some reference to the ungodly nature of the world; (3) promises for the believers and (or) threats for the unbelievers, often linked together to establish a contrast. In an investigation of the subject in 1956 its author reconstructed a typical Gnostic revelatory speech which incorporates the general characteristics, while avoiding the specific:

> I am the revealer who has descended from heaven. I am of God. You are of the world. God is light and the world is darkness. I proclaim to you the redemption of the world. Forsake the darkness, draw near to the light. Desist from the works of the world, and do the works of God. I am the helper sent by God. He who hearkens to me will see the light; he who does not hearken to me will sink into the darkness. (H. Becker.)

It is apparent that this kind of revealer speech corresponds not merely in substance but in pattern to the discourses in the Gospel according to John. Jesus himself did not speak in this manner at all, as the Synoptic sayings show. If he is presented as speaking like a Gnostic revealer, this is done to bring him to people in "modernized form," according to what appealed to the mind of the author's particular group or environment.

Whether the author of the Gospel took over some gnostic discourses and adapted them to his purpose or just wrote in the same vein is a problem that is relatively unimportant alongside of the insight that use has been made of the gnostic sphere of ideas, as a vehicle for describing the ministry of Jesus in its significance for the world, and of the forms of gnostic discourse for expressing his message.

The Situation Faced by the Author

At the time when John wrote Christianity faced the rise of heresies. A teaching against which he is in reaction, evidently denied the identity of the eternal Son of God with the man Jesus, and held either that there was only a temporary fusion of the two, or that Jesus was not a real man at all but only *seemed* to be one (Docetism from Gr. *dokéō,* "seem"). In the polemic of 1 Jn. and 2 Jn. we get further glimpses of this movement. In the decades that followed, Valentinus, Bardesanes, Basilides, Tatian and Marcion were to spread such denial of the true humanity of Christ far and wide. Over against this kind of thing John formulates his powerful "The Word *became flesh.*" The whole Gospel may be considered an illustration of this dictum, even though the thought itself is not repeated. Salvation is tied to faith in Christ as the Son of God, the messenger from on high. The stumbling block of the cross does not exist for the author of this Gospel; for him the raising of Jesus on the cross is the first step in his "glorification," i.e., in his return to the glory he had in heaven. The stumbling block John proclaims is the incarnation.

Another leading factor in this author's situation is the relationship of Christianity to the Jews, who must have been numerous in his environment. Exclusion of Christians from the synagogue had become a reality (cf. 9:22; 16:1–3). The "Jews" are referred to in an objective manner as though Jesus were not a Jew himself. He speaks of "their law" rather than "our law." He views them as representatives of the Satanic power in the world. The Pharisees are given a leading role and are even conceived of—quite unhistorically for Jesus' time, but correctly for the author's time—as a kind of official hierarchy (1:24; 7:45; 47 f.; 11:47, 57); but in the Passion narrative they are forgotten except for passing mention at the beginning (18:3). This is because in the Passion narrative the author is following a source in which they were not given prominence.

Within the author's horizon there was a sect of the followers of John the Baptist (cf. Acts 18:24 f.). They may have proclaimed John as the heavenly messenger. In the opening chapter the author draws a picture of John in which the Baptist disavows all claims for himself and sends disciples of his own to Jesus. If the latter, too, is described as practicing baptism (3:22 f.), the purpose of the author is evidently to show the sectarians that Jesus has everything John had and a great deal more. The Baptist's followers were apparently free from Christian pressure only in the Euphrates-Tigris lands, whither many emigrated. There they have survived to the present in sect of the Mandeans (see p. 123 ff.).

The relation to the Roman state is not clarified. There is obvious effort to exculpate Pilate as far as possible; he went to great length to release Jesus, but was coerced by the Jews to agree to the crucifixion. There is firm insistence on the kingly title for Jesus (12:13; 18:33 f.; 19:19), but it is made plain that his kingship is not of this world (18:36). An antithesis to the self-deification of the Caesars becomes visible in 20:28.

The Language

Various scholars have put forward the claim that the Fourth Gospel was originally written in an Aramaic dialect and translated into Greek. Few have been convinced by their arguments. A man much closer to the times and its literature than we are, Dionysius of Alexandria, in speaking of the language of the Gospel and 1 Jn. (in contrasting them with the Revelation of John) declares that they are not only "irreprehensible with respect to their Greek, but are most elegant in the arguments and the whole structure of the style" (Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 7,* 25). The locutions having Semitic parallels, which the Dead Sea Scrolls have increased, were evidently not of a nature to sound strange to those who spoke Koine Greek. In the Gospel prologue and in certain sayings, however, one detects indications that Semitic parallelism underlies or is imitated.

A stylistic peculiarity of this author is the double "amen" (usually rendered verily, verily) at the beginning of sayings particularly stressed, in contrast to the single "amen" in the Synoptics. He is fond of having Jesus speak in a manner, which requires repetition and clarification, and frequently shows the hearers misunderstanding him and being set right.

Time and Place of Origin

Tradition points to Ephesus as the place of origin, for here the beloved disciple—its supposed author—is said to have lived and labored. The colorful romance given in the apocryphal *Acts of John* has impressed this on the mind of humanity. In western Asia Minor, furthermore, this Gospel had its greatest historical repercussions. For it was on the basis of its chronology and its spirit that the churches of the proconsular province of Asia celebrated the Passover on the 14th of Nisan as a day of joy, owing to the redemption accomplished, and ended their fast at 3:00 P.M., the time of Christ's death, thereupon holding an Agape or "love feast" and celebrating the Eucharist. Easter was then celebrated on the 16th of Nisan. The practice of these "Quartodecimans" ("Fourteeners") clashed with that of Western Christians, who celebrated Easter on the Sunday after the 14th of Nisan, regardless of when that day happened to fall, and the crucifixion on the Friday before that Sunday, and who, considering Good Friday a day of mourning, continued the Fast until Easter. In Montanism, which had its beginnings in Phrygia, the Fourth Gospel also played a role, along with the book of Revelation. These are good indications of Asia Minor origin.

It is not impossible, of course, that the Gospel was brought to the Ephesian and Phrygian areas from elsewhere. Some have argued that it came from Alexandria; others have urged Syria as a more likely alternative in view of the somewhat similar thought in Ignatius and the Syriac *Odes of Solomon*. The Mesopotamian Father, Ephrem, in the fourth century claimed it was written at Antioch. North Syrian origin would agree with the prominence the Gospel gives Thomas, Philip and Andrew—Apostles in whom people in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor areas were interested, as the apocryphal Acts show. Palestinian origin, too, has been urged, both from the angle of comparison of the Johannine diction with that of the rabbinic sources and more recently on the basis of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In these one finds a Judaism that has been influenced by the dualistic type of thinking typical of Gnosis. People who came out of a sectarian environment such as that would naturally develop a different kind of Christianity than those who came out of the Pharisaically influenced quarter. One can suppose that two such types of Christianity existed in Palestine from early days. However, a link of John with a Palestinian-Gnostic sphere of thought is one thing, and the Palestinian origin of the Gospel another. As it is a Greek work it must have been written out in the Greek world, even though the author may have been a Palestinian by birth. Persons like Apollos (Acts 18:24), or Aquila and Priscilla (18:2; Rom. 16:3), or Lydia (Acts 16:14); or Phoebe (Rom. 16:1) show a surprising mobility, and that may have been characteristic too of Palestinian refugees after A.D. 70. Christian leaders from Judaea must have been in great demand in the congregations once they were footloose.

Claims for an early date of the Gospel according to John fly in the face of the beliefs of early churchmen that John wrote last. That general impression would seem to be the most dependable thing in their assertions about the origin of the

Gospel. This view is reinforced by realistic considerations. It is incredible that one living relatively close to the events would have given a portrayal of them differing so profoundly from the tradition recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. On the other hand, the date of the Gospel can scarcely be advanced beyond the end of the first century, because a papyrus fragment of it, which palaeographers date from the first half of the second century, has been found in Egypt (see p. 11). Channels for its quick transmission to Alexandria existed at Ephesus (cf. Acts 18:24). A date in the nineties of the first century thus seems possible.

John's work fittingly stands last in the Gospel tetralogy, for it brings the whole process of thought represented by the Gospels to its culmination. We need note here only how this is true in a single significant point. In Mark and Matthew the hope of the Second Coming of Christ is strong, though there is reflection about the delay. Luke has advanced to a revised position by making the period of Christ's presence on earth central, with the period of the Law and the Prophets preceding it and that of the Church following; the apocalyptic hope is preserved, but is without urgency, and the life in the world claims greater attention. In John there is an outreach into a new dimension. Apocalypticism has become superfluous, for one has eternal life in faith here and now, and the judgment takes place in the present (cf. 3:15 ff.; 5:24). Christ is the resurrection and the life (11:25). What was true in that situation of *c.* A.D. 30 was just as true when the author wrote; for through his Gospel the reader shared with the contemporaries of Jesus all they had seen and heard, including the assurances of the Holy Spirit's enduring presence and blessed aid, which even made it advantageous for them that Jesus was returning to the Father (16:7).

It staggers the imagination to ponder what influence has gone forth from this Gospel author. "Whatever 'John' did, whoever he was, wherever he lived and wrote, was to give creative expression to a type of faith and piety without which Europe might never have become even outwardly Christian." * The book opened the door for the Christological debates that were to rage in the following centuries. With its teaching of the Spirit's leading into all truth (16:13) it prepared the way for ecclesiastical dogmas going far beyond the scriptural witness, down to that of Papal infallibility and the most recent innovation: the immaculate conception of Mary (i.e., her birth by a virgin mother). Its paraclete, interpreted as manifesting himself in a future prophet, in the second century produced Montanus, helped to inspire the Persian Mani, founder of Manicheism in the third century and perhaps even had some bearing on Muhammad's claim of being the messenger of Allah. On the stimuli it contributed to Catholic piety and worship in East and West we cannot even begin to dwell.

It may have been the purpose of the Gospel author to replace completely all earlier Gospels then in use, just as it was Matthew's and Luke's purpose to replace Mark and Q. If so this purpose was foiled by the affection with which Christians in certain areas clung to the one or the other of the three. The stream of influence coming from Pharisaic Jewish Christianity was stronger than that coming from a Christianity emerging from gnostically influenced Judaism. The historical Christ was thus not dissolved into a timeless mythological figure. The Jesus of Nazareth, friend of the publicans and sinners, was still there. Certain elements of the Gospel according to John could even be fitted into the more realistic picture of the Synoptics and supplement it. On the other hand, the Gospel as a whole was available to satisfy the more speculatively or mystically inclined. The high valuation placed upon it by such men as Clement and Eusebius illustrates the appeal it had for the Christian intellectuals of antiquity. It had a similar attraction for many able minds of more recent history. It is like some lofty mountain peak, the very presence of which in the background, outranking other and nearer summits, in its profound mystery adds a center and crowning glamour to the total scene.

---

* Frederick C. Grant, *The Gospels,* p. 178. (See Bibliography.)

JOHN

THE PROLOGUE

1:1–18

This prologue forms an impressive gateway into the Gospel. It has long been realized that this material is distinct from the rest of the book and is partly of a poetic nature. The prevalent assumption is that a piece of hymnody was utilized for its making. This underlying poetry was not in the Greek manner, but in the Oriental, employing parallelism and the kind of rhythm found in Hebrew psalmody. The hymn may have had strophic structure, but this cannot be made certain owing to the incompleteness of its preservation and divergences of opinion as to the additions made by the author of the Gospel. One stands on rather firm ground in holding vv. 6–8, 15 to be from his hand. But vv. 9, 12c, 16–18 may also have been formulated or revised by him. The theme of the hymn was praise of the *Logos*. As to its origin, it may not have been Christian, but may rather have come from the circle around John the Baptist—a circumstance that would explain the additions downgrading him in comparison with Jesus.

"Logos," or "Word" was a term that had been prominently used in the old cosmological philosophy of the Greeks. Behind the law of the universe stood Reason, and because Reason manifests itself first in the spoken word, Logos was a suitable name for this manifestation of Reason. But Oriental thought had produced a speculation about a personified "wisdom" (Heb. *ḥokmā*, Gr. *sophía*) through which the deity supposedly created the universe. Without going into its Oriental antecedents, we may note that it appears on the scene in the Old Testament in Job 28:12–28, Prov. 8:22–9:10 and more significantly for New Testament interest in the apocryphal books Wisd. of Sol. 7:22–8:5, Bar. 3:28–38. In the newly discovered Galilean Aramaic Targum (Neofiti I) the idea is even introduced into the rendering of Gen. 1:1: "God through wisdom (*ḥokmethā*) created heaven and earth." A contact was established between the Logos idea and the Wisdom speculation—Logos appropriating the role which the Wisdom literature ascribed to *sophia*. The latter word is feminine (like the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents), and when personified was too reminiscent of a goddess to make it appropriate for a masculine redeemer figure. Logos, being a masculine word, could serve this purpose much better.

For the Alexandrian Jew Philo, the Logos is the head of numerous *lógoi* (pl.) and an intermediary between God and man. For it was unthinkable that God could have created or have had any direct contact with the world, which under impact from Platonism, was regarded as evil. In the Gnosis with which the Gospel author had contact, the Logos was conceived of not only as intermediary of creation but as bringer of divine revelation and as redeemer. The interest thus was not so much in cosmology as in soteriology. The hymn to the Logos utilized in this prologue may originally have had the Gnostic redeemer in mind. If so the evangelist took the step of equating Jesus Christ with this Logos. In Col. 1:15–17, Heb. 1:2 f. we have other examples of this type of advanced thinking and dependence on Gnosis. Thus the fourth evangelist sought to bring Christ to the men of a certain time and group in terms close to their religious-philosophical presuppositions.

1:1–9 The Logos-Creator as Rejected Redeemer. The allusion to Gen. 1:1 is unmistakable. "In the beginning" was the (personified) Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God (really put in inverted form: "and *God* was the Word"). Paradoxically it is associated with God (who naturally also existed in the beginning) and then identified with him to avoid any semblance of a duality of divine beings. If the Logos is God, this does not, however, mean that God and Logos are completely synonymous terms (cf. 14:28). Just as the "name of God" in the Old Testament can be substituted for "God" as he acts and reveals himself, so Logos stands for God in his creative, revelatory, and redemptive aspect.

In vv. 2–3 the author repeats part of v. 1, as though to soften the shock of that part which is not repeated ("the Word was God"). But then he proceeds to state that all things came into existence through the Logos, and that without him not one thing came into existence *that has come into existence.* (These last words are connected by some scholars—following second- and third-century interpretation—with v. 4, thus: "whatever has come into existence was life in him"; but this seems strained.) Left at the end of v. 3 the words make excellent sense, for they exclude all gnostic "emanations."

In v. 5 two auxiliary concepts are introduced to lend greater vividness to the Logos concept. In him was (divine, eternal) "life" (Gr. *zōē*), and this life was the light (Gr. *phōs*) of men (bringing them religious and moral illumination, cf. v. 9 f.). The poem thus passes from cosmology to soteriology, from creation to salvation—the thought being that the redemptive purpose was already inherent in creation. The light, it is then asserted, shines in the darkness and the darkness did not lay hold on it (to prevent it from shining).

In vv. 6–8 the Gospel author introduces a digression, which betrays itself by the lack of rhythmic form as well as by contents. "There was a man sent of God named John" (by whose appearance the way was prepared for the ministry of the Logos in the world). He came for testimony (only), that he might bear witness concerning the light (> life > Logos) that all might believe through him. (The position which Mark's Gospel had assigned to John is thus maintained, but instead of his being a "messenger" he was a "witness" for Jesus and instead of just witnessing to Jews his witness was for all men. Here there is recognition of the fact that the sect of John the Baptist had carried its message out into the Hellenistic world; cf. Acts 19:1 ff.) The statements that follow, however, restrict John to the role mentioned, over against attempts to give him an even larger importance. He was *not* the light, but (came only) to bear witness concerning the light. The formulation suggests that he was revered as "the light" by people of his sect. The words of appreciation, but at the same time of firm relegation, would excellently suit an Ephesian origin of the Gospel (cf. the Introduction).

In v. 9 the thought of v. 5, which was interrupted by the digression of vv. 6–8, is resumed, but in nonrhythmic manner: he (the Logos) was the true light that comes into the world—proved true by the fact that it illuminates every man. All humanity, conscious of it or not, receives illumination from this Logos light and its redemptive purpose.

1:10–13 The Gift of the Logos to Those Who Received Him

vv. 10–12b Although he was in the world (present at all times) and the world was (even) created by him, and (= yet) the world did not know him. (Yea) he came to "his own things" (i.e., his property), but (even) his own (people, cf. 1 Tim. 5:8) did not receive him. But to as many as did receive him, he gave power or authorization (cf. 5:27) to become children of God.

vv. 12c–13 The evangelist adds a prosaic explanation as to who these are to whom the preceding statement refers: those believing in his name (cf. 1 Jn. 5:13). This is no different from "believing in him," but merely indicates that insight into who he is—the Son of God—is implied (cf. 3:18). A further elaborating remark in v. 13 describes these believers as such who were begotten "out of God" (cf. 1 Jn. 3:9) and not (1) out of (human) blood (= flesh), nor (2) out of the will of the flesh, nor (3) out of the will of a man; the last phrase differs from the preceding one in that the will of a man is purposeful, while the will of the flesh is merely an instinctive drive. (A text correction of *who were begotten* in v. 13 to *who was begotten,* based on Latin sources, would make this verse apply to Jesus, and construes it as a testimony of the virgin birth; cf. the apocryphal *Epistle of the Apostles,* 3 (14). If that were the original reading, it would be incomprehensible that it should have been altered.)

1:14–18 The Incarnation and its Meaning as Seen in Retrospect. What has hitherto only been hinted at in figurative terms in vv. 4–5, 9–13 is disclosed in harsh direct statement: "the Logos became flesh." This may be regarded as the keynote of the whole Gospel according to John, and is the teaching defended in 1 Jn. 4:2 f., 2 Jn. 7. It is the great confession to the humanity of Christ over against Docetism (see p. 268). For this author, the term "flesh" does not have the liabilities it had for Paul, who would hardly have coined such an utterance; for him, Jesus came only "in the *likeness* of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3). On the other hand, it would scarcely have suited the evangelist to say, as does Paul, that "he emptied himself" (Phil. 2:7); he regards him as still retaining the capacities of the Logos even in his incarnation. That he "dwelt" (literally: tented) among us (12:35) indicates the transitory nature of his earthly sojourn. The author and his fellow believers can say in retrospect: "We saw his glory" (Gr. *dóxa*)—a word earlier writers used of the historical Jesus only at the Transfiguration (cf. Lk. 9:32), and otherwise exclusively of the heavenly Christ (Lk. 21:27; 24:26; cf. 2 Cor. 3:18; 1 Pt. 1:11). In the ministry of Jesus, as related in this Gospel, this "glory" was revealed every now and then in his "signs" (cf. 2:11). It is figuratively described as (like) that which an only begotten son gets from the father (for a father lavishes on an only son the substance that will be his in any case). Hence Jesus was full of grace and truth, two qualities inherent in his glory—truth being the true knowledge of God (cf. 8:45–47). (The R.S.V., following some scholars, transfers "full of grace and truth" to after "dwelt among us.")

v. 15 Again we meet a prosaic interpolation bringing in John the Baptist. The latter bears witness about him (i.e., Jesus) and cried out (in inspired speech) that this was he of whom he (had previously) said that the one coming after him (Mk. 1:7) was before him (in rank; an echo of Mk. 1:7b?), because he was first in comparison with John (being pre-existent).

vv. 16–17 Continuing the thought of v. 14 the text goes on to say: "For from his (Christ's) inexhaustible fullness" (Gr. *plērōma;* Col. 1:19; 2:9) we all took grace upon grace, i.e., one measure after the other—an ever-increasing amount of grace. This rich possession suggests a contrast with the pre-Christian situation: (only) the law was given through Moses; grace and truth (v. 14) came through Jesus Christ.

v. 18 With a powerful declaration in prose, the author ends his prologue. No one, he says, has ever seen God (contrast Ex. 24:10); the only begotten Son (thus many Greek texts and the Old Syriac version, while some of the best codices—S, B, C and also Pap. Bodmer II—have "God"), who is (now? or was previously?) in the bosom of the Father (i.e., lying at the Father's breast, cf. 13:23, as his dearly beloved Son)—*that one* (Gr. *ekeínos,* frequently used in this Gospel for *he*) related in full (the truth about him).

The way is now prepared for the signs and the revelatory discourses of the Gospel, and the reader is assured both of the intimate knowledge of God which Jesus had as well as of the authoritative nature of his working and speaking. It is strange that nowhere in the book does the author make use again of the Logos idea. It is as though he were unveiling the celestial background of what transpires on the earthly stage, just as the author of the book of Job does in the prose prologue to the great poem, which likewise makes no use of what was initially related.

PART I THE SELF-REVELATION OF THE SON TO THE WORLD

1:19–12:50

INTRODUCTION: THE PREPARATORY ROLE OF JOHN; JESUS GAINS FIVE DISCIPLES

1:19–51

1:19–24 The Witness of John the Baptist concerning Himself. While the author has already mentioned John and indicated his subordinate place over against those who exalted him unduly, he starts afresh by relating the occasion at which he bore the witness of vv. 8 and 15. It was when he was being questioned by the priests and Levites sent down from Jerusalem by "the Jews" (i.e., the hierarchy acting for the people). They ask: "Does he claim to be the Messiah, Elias (Mal. 3:23), or 'the prophet'" (Deut. 18:15)? His negative answers were unsatisfactory to his examiners. They insisted on something positive (based on Scripture) about himself that they could report back to their superiors. John then identified himself as "the voice crying in the wilderness" (Is. 40:3, following LXX interpretation, for the Hebrew means: "A voice cries: in the wilderness prepare," etc.). The evangelist notes that those sent were from (= out of? or sent by?) the Pharisees. It seems best to regard v. 24 as a link for what follows: the extension of the interrogation to a matter of particular interest to Pharisaism —that of his baptism, which invited comparison with their proselyte baptism (see p. 40).

1:25–28 The Testimony of John concerning the Presence of the Messiah. The questioners, ignoring his self-identification with the voice of Is. 40:3, ask why he baptizes if he is not one of the personages they had mentioned? As nothing is said in the Old Testament about any prospective baptizing by the Messiah, Elias or "the prophet," this question is puzzling. Perhaps the thought is only that John is introducing a religious innovation, without having such authority for doing so as might be conceded to the Messiah and the eschatological prophets. John replies that he is baptizing with (mere) water—an apparent denial of the value placed on his baptism in Mk. 1:4. There is standing unrecognized among them (not necessarily in the audience, but present in the world) the one "coming after him" (v. 15), whose sandals he is not worthy to loose (cf. Mk. 1:7). (The mention of the baptism to be carried out by the coming one, Mk. 1:8, is deferred until v. 33.) That John already knows him is not revealed here, but may be inferred from vv. 32 ff.

The incident concludes with mention of the place where John gave his basic testimony that the Messiah was already present: Bethany beyond the Jordan, where he was baptizing. Origen (*c.* 230) held that the correct reading was *Bethabara,* on the ground that Bethany lay elsewhere. Origen's reading got into some later manuscripts and hence into the A.V. However, the best manuscripts support the reading Bethany. It may originally have been spelled a bit differently than the Bethany of 11:1, but in the Greek text tradition the name-forms have been merged.

1:29–34 The Witness of John concerning the Identity of the Messiah and the Nature of His Work

v. 29 A second scene follows on the next day (after the visit of the delegation). The unknown one is publicly introduced, though the audience is not described. John sees Jesus approaching—when he had met him previously (cf. v. 30) is not revealed —and hails him as the lamb of God (i.e., provided by God) "that lifts up and takes away the sin of the world." Perhaps in the received material John merely said, "Behold the lamb of God" (cf. v. 36), but the author or editor has deepened this by reference to the Passion. It is an important point in this Gospel that the death of Jesus took place at the very hour when it was customary to sacrifice the Passover lambs. The author's position is like that of Paul when he says, "For Christ our paschal lamb has been sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5:7; cf. 19:14). "Taking away sin" (cf. 1 Jn. 3:5) is a very broad way of describing what Jesus did. The phraseology suggests no emphasis on atonement (though that thought appears in 1 Jn. 2:2; 4:10, presumably written by this same author). In the Gospel, however, forgiveness of sins is not especially linked with the death of Jesus, but is rather the effect of his Word (8:31 f.). But the outstanding feature about the saying is its scope. The sin (= guilt) of the *world* is lifted up and carried off by Christ. (Contrast the atonement for "many," Mk. 10:45). This corresponds with the teaching that he is the Logos world-creator (1:3). Nothing less will do than to have him be world-redeemer.

v. 30–34 The Baptist did not know him (when he had first seen him), but the whole purpose of John's coming and baptizing with (mere) water was to discover his identity and to make him known to "Israel" (the religious name for the Hebrew people in this age). And John now bears solemn witness as to how he recognized him: he saw the Spirit descending on Jesus as (i.e., in the guise of?) a dove, remaining on him permanently. He had been prepared for this vision by a previous divine revelation by Him who sent him to baptize with (mere) water: when he should see this being fulfilled he would know that the indicated one would baptize with Holy Spirit (cf. Mt. 3:11). And so John, having experienced the vision, testifies that this one (therefore) is the Son of God (in the exalted sense of his heavenly origin and intimate association with the Father). It is noteworthy that the evangelist avoids mentioning that John baptized Jesus. The author is dependent on the same tradition as the Synoptics, but has drawn the consequences of such a thought as the one expressed in Mt. 3:14.

1:35–51 The Baptist's Testimony Leads Disciples to Jesus. The evangelist here uses traditional material about Jesus' winning his first pair of followers from the disciples of John, and how these drew in two others. This is not an original "simple story" (see p. 19 f.), for it lacks the characteristic features. It is "historical" narration and takes the place of the calling of the first disciples in the Synoptics. While the author later alludes to the "Twelve," he does not relate the appointment of such a group. Of the five disciples Jesus acquires, one is unidentified and another unknown to the Synoptic tradition.

vv. 35–40 On the next day John is standing with two of his disciples, and seeing Jesus walking about he repeats his testimony of v. 29 in shorter (more original?) form: "Behold the lamb of God." (This formulation is scarcely John's. He would have used a Messianic designation; it was in the light of his death that Jesus became the lamb.) The two thereupon "follow" Jesus (forsaking John). Turning, Jesus sees them following and asks what they seek. Addressing him as "rabbi," which the author translates as "teacher" for the benefit of Greek readers, they ask him where he is staying. He says, "Come and you will see." They came and saw where he was staying and remained with him that day. The author, perhaps to give the impression of exact reporting, notes that it was the tenth hour (4:00 P.M.) when these first two disciples met Jesus. One is identified as Andrew, while the other is left nameless. When one is left nameless in story-telling of this nature, it is because of a desire to give him no credit, reflecting early rivalries (cf. the case of the unnamed companion of Cleopas, Lk. 24:18). The great rivals of Andrew (and his brother Peter) were James and John (Mk. 10:35 f.), who are never mentioned in the basic Gospel; only the appendix makes passing reference to them as "the sons of Zebedee" (21:2). It is highly probable that Andrew's companion is imagined as James (put first in Mk. 1:19) or John.

v. 41 If they stayed with Jesus "that day" (v. 39), it would seem to be implied that what is now related took place the next day. However, it could be imagined as occurring in the evening (which would already be the next day, if Jewish time-reckoning is presupposed). It was so understood by the Sinaitic Syriac. Andrew first (Gr. *prôton*) finds his brother Simon. The text has his "own" (Gr. *ídios*) brother, but in the Koine this merely means "his." (Some manuscripts have "as first one" (Gr. *prōtos*), implying that the other individual then found *his* brother (James, John; or John, James). If he wrote "first," as seems likely, the author was thinking of the encounters in vv. 43 and 45.) Andrew tells Simon that they have found the Messias (Aram. word-form with Gr. *s* ending). The evangelist explains the word for Greek readers as meaning "anointed one" (Gr. *Christós*). (In Mk. this is the crowning insight, attained only by Simon, as Jesus' ministry nears its end, Mk. 8:27 f.) Jesus with his supernatural knowledge (2:25) identifies him when he lays eyes on him: "Thou art Simon son of John, thou shalt be called *Kēphas";* the evangelist adds "which is interpreted Peter" (Gr. *Pétros*). The name Cephas (the Latin spelling) for Peter is not found elsewhere in this Gospel or in the others—he is called Simon or Peter or Simon Peter—but it is used by Paul in Gal. 1:18, etc., 1 Cor. 1:12, etc., and was evidently the name by which he was known before he passed over into the Greek world, when he took the name Petros. Mt.: 16:18 reflects on the name Petros, assuming what is expressed flatly here, that it is the translation of Aram. *kēphā,* "rock" (but cf. p. 158).

vv. **43–44** The following day he (Jesus) desires to go out (of Judaea) into Galilee; he finds Philip, and bids him to "follow" him (as disciple). One may suspect that in the tradition as received by the author, it was Andrew who found Philip and then brought him to Jesus. Philip was from Bethsaida, "out of the city of Andrew and Peter." Since the name of the ruler of the Tetrarchy to which Bethsaida belonged was Philip (see p. 64) it may well be that the disciple Philip was named after him and that his home is correctly given. But one must be skeptical about Bethsaida's being the city of Andrew and Peter. They are securely anchored in Capernaum by the Synoptics. That they have been transferred to Bethsaida may be rooted in the decline of Christianity at Capernaum. Even the connection of Jesus with Capernaum (2:12; 4:46); is played down by this evangelist; from his presentation one would never guess that it was "his city" (Mt. 9:1).

vv. **45–50** Philip finds Nathanael. This seems to be derived from a separate story, since it involves Philip's separation from the group without mention of how it came about. He informs him: "The one whom Moses, in the Law (= the Pentateuch), and the Prophets wrote about we have found—Jesus son of Joseph from Nazareth." Messianic prophecy from the Pentateuch had greater weight than that from the prophetic books, hence was put first. Whoever formulated the story of ch. 21 claimed that Nathanael was from Cana in Galilee (21:2), but it is strange that this is not mentioned here or in ch. 2. Nathanael replies with the question, "What good can come out of Nazareth?" (This is no doubt a derogatory remark that circulated in Galilean towns in view of Christian claims that Jesus was the Messiah.) Philip invites him to come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael coming and said about him, "Behold, truly an Israelite (i.e., one who is worthy of the religious name for the Jewish people) in whom there is no deceit." It is assumed that Jesus knows his name, just as he was able to identify Simon prior to any introduction (v. 42); for Nathanael asks: "Whence knowest thou me?" Jesus replies that he had seen him when he was under the fig tree, before Philip called him. (In v. 45 it was said Philip "found" Nathanael; here it is indicated that he called to him, seeing him under a fig tree.) The assumption of course is that this was beyond the range of actual sight; Jesus has supernatural sight and knows what goes on elsewhere. This demonstration of his clairvoyance overcomes Nathanael so that he replies, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel." It seems likely that the received material had only the second of these statements and that the evangelist has prefaced the first to take the edge off the political Messianism that crops out here.

v. **51** The evangelist wants Jesus to have the last word. The introductory "and he said to him" marks this as supplementary. It is out of line, furthermore, with the fact that a plurality of persons is addressed in the Amen-saying itself. They will see greater things (than this his demonstration of clairvoyance): heaven opened (Acts 7:56) and the angels ascending (from) and descending to the Son of man. The imagery was evidently suggested by Gen. 28:12. There the ascent and descent of the angels was to and from a place; here, less vividly, it is to and from a person. It means that Jesus will be in constant communication with God, and God with him through the angelic intermediaries. Jesus calls himself the Son of man. In 3:13 the Son of man ascends and descends in person. The title either signifies his heavenly origin on the basis of Dan. 7:13, or is just the evangelist's substitute for Jesus' own first-person pronoun, following the example set by the Synoptics but no longer with the eschatological significance it has in them.

A. JESUS IN GALILEE, JERUSALEM (1ST JOURNEY) AND SAMARIA 2:1–4:42

2:1–11 The Sign at the Marriage of Cana (Sign I)

vv. 1–5 We here encounter what from the form-critical point of view must originally have been an independent story of the elaborate type (see p. 20). However, John, unlike Mark, is an author who remolds his material instead of handing it down in its pristine form.

The initial statement already shows Johannine editing: *on the third day* there was a marriage at Cana. The story as an originally independent one naturally had no such time indication. The author in connecting it up with what preceded did not do so with any thought of the time required for the journey from the Jordan to Cana (which could not be made within that period). The figure is probably symbolical. It is a foreshadowing of the resurrection on the third day after the crucifixion that this advance manifestation of the heavenly origin of Jesus took place on the third day (after the beginning of his ministry, marked by the calling of the first disciples).

Rather strangely the mother of Jesus is present at a marriage at "Cana of Galilee" (so designated to distinguish it from the Cana of Josh. 19:28 in Tyrian territory). This must mean the Cana mentioned by Josephus (*Vita,* 16–17), and lying northeast of Sepphoris. Did the story imagine her as a resident of Cana, rather than of Nazareth? In 4:46, too, Jesus is going back to Cana. The story evidently came into the Gospel tradition from a Christian community at that place. That community also claimed Nathanael as one of its sons (21:2). If Christians were expelled from Nazareth, as seems probable, some may have migrated for a time to that place—perhaps including Jesus' mother and brethren. In this way some line of tradition may have come to connect Jesus' mother with it. Some scholars think that the story originally did not mention the disciples as having been invited to the marriage, but that they have been substituted for Jesus' "brethren." In the version found in the apocryphal *Epistle of the Apostles,* Jesus, his mother, and his brethren alone are mentioned. It would then be part of the evangelist's adaptation that he introduced the disciples (cf. also on v. 12). This was not only desirable in view of the previous narrative of the calling of disciples, but had the further advantage of suggesting to the reader that the unexpected increase in the number of guests was responsible for the shortage of wine.

Jesus' mother, who is more firmly rooted in the story than are the disciples, reports this situation to him. His reply, "What have I to do with thee, o woman?" uses a familiar Hebrew idiom (cf. Judg. 11:12; 2 Sam. 16:10; 19:22). It undoubtedly places distance between him and his mother. The emphasis, however, lies on his further remark, "My hour has not yet come." ("The hour" in this Gospel is generally that of the supreme manifestation of his glory in the Passion; cf. 7:6, 30; 8:20; 12:23; 13:1; 17:1.) Jesus follows the law of his own destiny; when the hour to act (and thus take the first step toward the Passion) comes, he will know it; advance suggestion by others is resented (cf. 7:2–10). His mother, however, tells the servants to follow his directions. Perhaps the author's purpose in mentioning this is merely to expedite the action and to introduce the servants, whose aid will be needed shortly.

vv. 6–10 The narrator now notes that there were six stone water-jars lying there "according to the purification of the Jews" (i.e., for the purpose of washing the hands before eating; cf. Mk. 7:2; Mt. 15:2); stone vessels supposedly did not become defiled, as earthenware ones did. In this case the jars were of large size—each holding two or three ten-gallon measures. Jesus commands the servants to fill them with water, and after they are filled to the brim, he tells them to draw (a sample) and take it to the president of the banquet (Gr. *architríklinos*). The latter, ignorant of what has happened, tastes it, and finding it to be wine superior to that previously served, chides the bridegroom, instructing him as to what is generally done at banquets: first one serves the good wine, and when people are drunk, the inferior wine. The groom (ignorantly) has kept the good wine until now! This is a humorous touch in the story. Its function, however, is not to amuse but to provide an attestation of the miracle, while at the same time seeming to keep it from the public. (Not even the president of the banquet knew whence the wine was—only the servants, as v. 9 notes.) Rather strangely the story ends therewith.

v. 11 The evangelist merely appends his solemn conclusion: Jesus "made this beginning of the signs" in Cana of Galilee and revealed his glory (in secret, to those aware of the miracle), and his disciples (who were among these) believed in him (as Son of God). The story implies that there will be more "signs." This Old Testament concept refers to a miracle or other supernatural indication which is not just something over which one marvels, but which has a deeper meaning. The meaning here is: the author saw that the exercise of power showed Jesus to have the glory mentioned in 1:14. The miracle is symbolical of his entire ministry. (Allegorizing can of course read many other things into it. Thus, e.g., the wine could refer to the Eucharist, as the bread indubitably does in 6:1 ff., 48 ff.).

How could a miracle of this kind be attributed to Jesus? The question will not trouble those who compel themselves to believe that this is historically dependable narration, but it must necessarily concern those who find it incredible. For such, it is attractive to suppose that a myth of the "Epiphany" or manifestation of a divinity of the Dionysius type has here been transferred to Jesus. This god was the patron of the vintners, the giver of wine. Miraculous instances of his giving wine were reported. Thus at Elis in the Peloponnesus, three empty jars were set in his temple on the eve of his annual festival, and on the following morning were found full of wine; at the island of Andros and at Teos on the Asia Minor coast, the springs of the temple are said to have gushed forth wine instead of water on that holy day. At Cana the story may have told how the god Dionysius appeared in person and turned water into wine. Folklore is full of instances in which an old pagan festival was Christianized, and its cult story attributed to a saint. In some such way, one may suppose, a Dionysius Epiphany story was transferred to Jesus. The cult myth may have ended with the disappearance of the god after the miracle (cf. Judg. 6:21; 13:20). The necessary omission of that element in the Christian adaptation to the story of Jesus may explain the sudden ending, which is only superficially covered up by the concluding observation of v. 11 that Jesus did this in Cana of Galilee as the beginning of the signs, and (so first) revealed his glory, and that his disciples believed in him.

For the Christian reader the charm of the story lies in the presence of Jesus at a romantic occasion and in his effective help in minor human concerns.

2:12 An Excursion to Capernaum. An excursion of Jesus to Capernaum with his mother, brethren [and his disciples] is now related. (Codex S and the Old Latin omit mention of the disciples. While they may be original textually here one may surmise that they were brought into the story by the evangelist, as was also held likely in 2:2.) This author does not report that Jesus migrated to Capernaum, as do the Synoptics (Mt. 4:13; Lk. 4:31). As noted in the comment on 1:44, John is inclined to minimize Capernaum's importance in the Gospel story. He insists that Jesus did not remain there many days. He is primarily interested in showing Jesus in action at Jerusalem, the center of Jewish life, where all great decisions were made. The visit to Capernaum is an echo of the older tradition.

2:13–22 First Jerusalem Journey; Cleansing of the Temple (cf. Mk. 11:15–19; Mt. 21:12–13; Lk. 19:47–48). The story of the cleansing of the Temple, like its parallel in the Synoptic Gospels, is a story of the simple type in which a striking saying of Jesus is of central importance. The evangelist makes this the first public act by Jesus, whereas the Synoptics put it in the only Jerusalem visit reported—that leading to the Passion. John could not very well have Jesus go repeatedly to Jerusalem, but have him take cognizance of the commercialization of the Temple only at the last visit.

v. 13 In introducing the narrative the author merely notes that Jesus went up to Jerusalem for the (Passover-) festival, without making clear whether from Capernaum or elsewhere. We are left to infer from v. 17 that the disciples went along.

vv. 14–16 He "found" sitting in the Temple the venders of [oxen, sheep and] doves, and the money changers. [He made a whip out of cords (lead-strings of cattle picked up from the ground?) and drove them *all* out of the Temple—the sheep and the oxen.] He poured out the coins of the money-changers and upset the tables, and ordered those selling doves to take these things (i.e., the cages) away, saying, "Do not make the house of my Father (cf. Lk. 2:49) a house that is an emporium" (Gr. *empórion*).

The story does not run quite smoothly; if he drove *all* out of the Temple, how can some be left to hear his saying? Realization of this led to an attempt to restrict the driving out to the oxen and sheep. Comparison with the Synoptic story suggests that the oxen and sheep were newly introduced, and that this stimulated the further thought of the making of the whip, which was needed only to drive out quadrupeds. The received story merely told of money-changers and of the vendors of doves, and the saying of Jesus, in which the point of the whole incident resides, applied to both groups. Bringing in the sacrificial animals increased the anticultic significance of the act, and introducing the whip-making was a stroke of poetic genius. The saying of Jesus differs markedly from that in the Synoptic version, but is equally striking.

v. 17 The evangelist adds a further element. The disciples (after Jesus' death and resurrection, cf. 12:16) recalled the prophecy of Ps. 69:10, "The zeal for thy house *will* eat me up." The future tense is substituted for the past in this quotation. It is thus significant not only for the incident but for the whole ministry of Jesus: his zeal for God's house (understood figuratively) will bring on his death. If in the Synoptic Gospels the cleansing of the Temple is placed just before the Passion, this evangelist introduces the Passion element into the story itself. This is reinforced in v. 18 f.

vv. 18–22 As in the oldest Gospel, Jesus is confronted with the question of his authority after the cleansing of the Temple. The Jews (meaning the hierarchy, as in 1:19; cf. Mk. 11:27) demand a "sign" as proof of it. In Mt. 12:39 f. he replied to a similar request with the sign of Jonah (i.e., his resurrection). Here in v. 19 the same thought takes different form: "Destroy (= you will destroy) this Temple and in three days I will raise it up." (A similar saying was allegedly attributed to Jesus at his trial, Mk. 14:58; Mt. 26:61.) The Jews ridicule this reply by saying that the Temple has been in process of construction for forty-six years, and he would rebuild it in three days! (The building activity initiated by Herod began 20–19 B.C. according to Jos., *Ant., 15,* 11, 1; *20,* 9, 7, and this would indicate a date of A.D. 27–28; cf. p. 206.) The evangelist explains in v. 21 that he spoke of the temple of his body, and adds that this did not become clear to the disciples until after his death and resurrection (cf. v. 17). Then they recalled the saying and believed both the Scripture (= prophecy of the third day, Hos. 6:2) and the word Jesus had spoken. The question is, however, whether v. 21 refers to the whole saying of v. 19 or only to its second half. Assuming the latter to be the case, one may reason that the saying is formulated in the light of two facts: (1) that the Temple was destroyed in A.D. 70 and that the Jews themselves brought on the catastrophe; (2) that the Christian congregation is, figuratively speaking, a temple (1 Cor. 3:16–17; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21), replacing the Jewish Temple, and at the same time is the "body of Christ" (1 Cor. 12:12–27). These two things, one may hold, have then been brought into a relationship in the formulation of the saying. If one takes the entire saying of v. 19 as referring to the body of Jesus, then he was predicting his death at the hands of the Jews and his resurrection by his own power (10:18), the latter act being the sign they had asked for.

2:23–25 Untrustworthy Converts. A "summary report" gives a general idea of Jesus' activity at Jerusalem when he was "at the Passover, at the feast" (the latter phrase originally a text variant?). Many believed in his name (cf. 1:12), seeing his signs (cf. 4:45, but contrast 7:21). But he did not trust himself to them, because he knew all (men) and had no need that anyone should testify concerning the man (with whom he was concerned, cf. 1:43, 48), for he knew what was in the man (in question). A pessimistic view of human nature (cf. Gen. 6:5) seems to be implied. It is not made clear whether his trusting himself to no one is meant literally (cf. Jos., *Ant., 12,* 10, 2, where the Jews mistakenly trust themselves to Bacchides), or is figurative for trusting them with further teaching about himself or the kingdom. Perhaps the latter interpretation is better, since such teaching is then imparted to one individual—Nicodemus. In any case vv. 23–25 have a purely transitional function.

3:1–21 Jesus Instructs a Teacher of the Law. Nicodemus is introduced as one "out of the Pharisees," and a "ruler" (Gr. *archōn*) of the Jews, meaning a member of the Synedrium (cf. Lk. 23:13; Acts 3:17). Josephus tells of an earlier man of that name (*Ant., 14,* 3, 2), and rabbinic sources know of a Naqdemon (= Nicodemus) son of Gorion who lived in the days of the siege of Jerusalem. The Nicodemus who was Jesus' contemporary was a rabbi (v. 10). He is apparently a representative of the class of persons mentioned in 2:23–24. However, he comes under the cover of darkness, and hence does not want to be publicly identified with Jesus. He begins with the respectful admission that Jesus is a teacher who has come from God, for no one is able to do the signs he does unless God is with him. (He thus wants to hear more of his teaching.) But from such a rational basis one cannot appreciate what Jesus seeks. With an Amen-saying he declares that unless one is begotten from above (of God 1:13; 1 Jn. 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1) he is not able to see (= share in, 3:36; Mk. 9:1) the kingdom of God. (Here and in v. 5 are the only uses of the term in the same sense as in the Synoptic Gospels.) The ambiguity in the word for "from above" or "again" (Gr. *ánōthen*) is exploited by the author, who makes Nicodemus take it in the sense of "again" and hence think of new birth, while Jesus employs it in the sense of "from above" and hence means "begotten." Nicodemus asks how one can be born again when old. Can he return to his mother's womb and be born again? Jesus repeats the statement with the further clarifying words "begotten through [water and] Spirit" and varying "seeing" with "entering into" the kingdom. (It takes a creative act of God to get one out of mere carnal existence to spiritual life.) Then he explains that what is begotten through flesh is flesh, what is begotten through Spirit is spirit. (The bracketed reference to water in 3:5 is probably glossatory, and was introduced as a reference to baptism. It is not repeated in 3:6.)

vv. 7–12 Jesus now bids Nicodemus not to wonder about the command, "You must be begotten from above." As the wind comes and goes, so it is with him who is begotten through the Spirit. (One feels the action of the Spirit as one does the blowing of the wind, without understanding its whence and whither.) Again Nicodemus asks how this can come about. Jesus expresses astonishment that "the teacher of (all) Israel" (an honorific phrase found also in rabbinic sources) does not know this. Referring to himself in the first-person plural, Jesus says that he speaks of what he knows, testifies of what he has seen, but they (Nicodemus and others) will not accept his testimony. If they do not believe when he speaks of earthly things (such as those just mentioned in vv. 3–8) how could they believe were he to speak of heavenly things (such as his incarnation and glorification)?

v. 13 The meaning of the verse in this context is obscure. No one has gone up to heaven except he who came down from there, the Son of man (again use of the Synoptic phrase of 1:51). Some take this as anachronistic, presupposing the ascension of Jesus, or as a testimonial of the author rather than as spoken by Jesus. It may, however, explain why Nicodemus cannot understand the heavenly things and why Jesus does understand; no one has gone up to heaven (and sojourned there;) only the Son of man who has descended from heaven (sojourned there) and hence has the heavenly insight (cf. 3:31–32).

vv. 14–21 (To bring redemption to humanity) Jesus must be raised aloft as Moses raised the serpent (Num. 21:8), so that everyone who believes will live, as did those of the Mosaic days, but forever. (The raising aloft means both on the cross, so 8:28; 12:32; and to heaven, 8:28; 12: 32, 34.) Then follows in v. 16 one of the most glorious and profound sayings of the Gospel. While formally Jesus himself is speaking, the reader senses that this is really the author testifying. "God so loved the world that he gave (= sent; not 'gave as a sacrifice,' as in Gal. 1:4) his only begotten Son so that everyone who believes in him will not perish, but have everlasting life." For—so John continues —God sent the Son to save the world through him, not to judge it. He who believes in him is not judged, but he who does not believe in him is already judged because of failing to believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God. This (already) is the judgment (over men) that the light came into the darkness but that men loved the darkness more than the light, because their words were evil. Everyone who does evil (5:29) (actually) hates the light and will not come to it, lest his works be exposed. But he who "does" the truth (i.e., acts in a manner productive of it) comes to the light that his works may be revealed, for they were done "in God." (The punitive element is thus eliminated from the judgment idea, and the eschatological frame of reference is given up and replaced by the thought of a continuous process, in which the good and the bad reveal what they are: through their reaction to Christ.)

Therewith the instruction given Nicodemus ends; he drops out to reappear in 7:50; 19:39. His induction into these mysteries of the kingdom thus does not seem to have been in vain.

3:22–30 Parallel Activity of Jesus and John the Baptist

vv. 22–30 After these things Jesus and his disciples came (= went, cf. 9:7) into the "Judaean land (= rural Judaea), and he lingered there with them and baptized." If he carries on a ministry of baptizing (cf. 3:5 where baptism is essential for entry into the kingdom) this must refer to the Jordan valley. John was simultaneously baptizing at Aenon near Salim "because there was water there." The name Aenon is simply Hellenized Heb. *'Ayin,* "spring" or "spring place." (In the time of Eusebius both Aenon and Salim were sought south of Scythopolis. A situation on the west side of the Jordan is indicated by v. 26.) The Gospel notes that John had not yet been cast into prison; this tradition differs radically from Mk. 1:14, and probably is not as dependable.

The evangelist speaks of a dispute between the disciples of John the Baptist and a Jew concerning cleansing (2:6, cf. Mk. 7:1 f.). In some way this must have involved a disparaging comparison of the baptism of John with that of Jesus, for it is the occasion of a report to John by his disciples. Addressing him as rabbi, they state that Jesus is baptizing and that "all are going to him" (but cf. v. 23). The name of Jesus is expressly avoided, but they allude to his having been with John "beyond the Jordan" and to John's having testified with respect to him. The whole purpose of the incident is to give John a further opportunity to bear witness.

vv. 27–30 In his reply John declares his belief in the divine sovereignty with a proverbial statement: A man cannot take anything except what is given him from heaven (= God; cf. Mk. 11:30); see similar statements 6:65; 19:11. The disciples themselves can testify on his behalf that he said he was not the Christ (1:20), but was sent before him (1:30). The groom is the one who has the bride; the friend of the groom, standing (after escorting him to the bridal chamber) and hearing him, rejoices greatly on account of the voice of the groom (with its happy sound).

Therefore (his role being like that of the friend), this his joy is fulfilled (has attained its fullest possible measure in this news of the success of Jesus). "That one" (Jesus) *must* increase, he himself must decrease. (There is no self-pity in these words, for John sought nothing for himself in his ministry.) On the marriage symbolism used, cf. the beautiful Syriac "Hymn of the Soul." *

3:31–36 Keynote of the Revelatory Discourses. The speech of John is apparently continuing, though the situation of 3:26 f. actually was exhausted with v. 30. We here have a revelatory discourse, or at least a part of one. Some scholars think this piece originally followed v. 21, in which case it would be attributed to Jesus. As matters now stand, however, it was spoken by John.

The superior rank of Jesus is due to his heavenly origin. The one who has come from above is above all, while he who is from the earth (Gen. 2:7) is of the earth and speaks from (the sphere of) the earth. (That this was coined to fit the case of John seems doubtful since he is divinely sent. The subject is to be taken collectively.) What Christ has seen and heard (in heaven concerning God 3:13, 1:18) he testifies to, yet no one receives his testimony. (This loses sight of 3:26 and is a pessimistic reflection; cf. 1:5, 10; 3:11, etc.) The one receiving his testimony has put his seal to it that God is true (cf. 1 Jn. 5:10 where nonacceptance makes God a liar). The one sent by God speaks the words of God. For not out of a measure does God give the Spirit (but rather without measure, namely to Christ, so that his words are God's). Since he loves the Son he has put everything into his hands. Hence whoever believes in the Son has eternal life, while he who disbelieves will not see life. Indeed, the wrath of God remains upon such a one.

As in the case of the Nicodemus incident, there is no narrative ending. The author raises the curtain, but does not let it down again.

4:1–42 Jesus and the Samaritan Woman. The older tradition had no use for the Samaritans. In Luke we found a change of attitude, based no doubt on the fact that Christianity had made progress among them (Acts 8:4 f.). The fourth evangelist, therefore, can utilize here another story of the elaborate type, telling of a visit by Jesus to a locality in Samaria. It is safe to assume that it came from the place mentioned in it. This author has naturally adapted the narrative to his purpose, probably cutting out the material of real story-interest. A vestige of that apparently remains in vv. 16–18. He works the story into the present connection by means of the opening verses.

vv. 1–4 When the "Lord" (some manuscripts and versions: Jesus) knew (supernaturally) that the Pharisees had heard about his "making" (= acquiring) and baptizing more disciples than John, he left Judaea and went again to Galilee. A parenthetical remark (glossatory in view of 3:32) asserts that Jesus did not baptize, but only his disciples did (cf. the apostolic practice, 1 Cor. 1:17; Acts 10:48). The narrator states that "it was necessary" for Jesus to go through Samaria. The necessity, however, seems to be the author's, who has to bring him to the scene required by the story. (Or was it important to keep out of John's way, if he were baptizing farther up in the Jordan valley?)

v. 5 Jesus comes to a city of Samaria, named "Sychar" (a corruption of *Sikima*—Shechem, as noted by Jerome), situated near the piece of ground which Jacob had given Joseph (a combination of Gen. 33:19; 48:22; Josh. 24:32). Here was the well of Jacob—no doubt identical with the very deep one still existing today at the foot of Mt. Gerizim. Tired of wayfaring, Jesus sat down by the well about the sixth hour (noon). Again, as in 1:39, this lends the impression of exactitude. However, the purpose in this case may merely be to suggest why Jesus was weary and thirsty.

vv. 7–14 A woman "of Samaria" (i.e., the district), no doubt with her water jar on her head, comes to fetch water. Jesus asks her to give him to drink. The evangelist explains that the disciples had gone to the city to buy food. The woman expresses surprise at the request. The author here explains that Jews had no traffic with Samaritans. (This agrees poorly with the disciples' going into the city.) The author does not relate that the woman gave Jesus water to drink—for his interest is solely in the conversation. Jesus hints that if she knew his identity she would ask him and he would give her living water. The latter phrase means spring water (Gen. 26:19, etc.) as distinct from cistern water, but here is used figuratively for the revelation Jesus imparts. The woman, however, thinks of mundane things only. He has no pail and the well is deep (so he could not even get well water). Whence would he get living water? Is he more than Jacob, who gave the people this well and hallowed it by his own use? Jesus thereupon says that he who drinks from this water (of the well) will thirst again, but whoever drinks from the water he will give him will never thirst again. The water he gives him will become in that person a fountain of water welling up to eternal life. (Such an individual has that constantly self-renewing fountain in himself, by virtue of having quaffed of the water Jesus dispenses.)

---

* For a translation see F. Crawford Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 1904, 211 ff.

vv. 15–16 Ignorant of what Jesus is driving at (which is not surprising in view of this oracular type of speech), the woman, addressing him as "Lord," asks him for this water. Naïvely she reasons that it would save her the work of coming to the well to draw water. Jesus bids her call her husband and come back, but she denies having one. He now shows supernatural knowledge of her personal history. She has indeed rightly said that she has no husband. For she has had five husbands (a rabbinic parallel suggests that this is a maximum), and the one whom she now has is not her husband. She has spoken this (much) truly.

The woman now realizes that Jesus must be a prophet. Taking advantage of the opportunity to consult such a one, she raises the controversial issue between Jews and Samaritans: the fathers of the latter had prayed on this mountain (Mt. Gerizim), while the Jews insisted Jerusalem was the only legitimate sanctuary. (What does he have to say about this?) In his reply Jesus predicts the end of worship at both places (fulfilled for Jerusalem when the Gospel was written). But he criticizes the Samaritans as worshiping what they do not know (allusion to the syncretistic cult carried on by them?). The Jews (with whom he here reckons himself) worship what they know, for salvation comes from the Jews. (The statement is surprising in view of John's anti-Semitism, but certainly not impossible; cf. 1:11.) However, the arrival of this salvation, which is taking place now (cf. 5:22), changes matters. It will terminate the sanctity of Jerusalem and its Temple. Henceforth all true worshipers will worship the Father in Spirit and in truth, i.e., it will be a spiritual worship corresponding to the true knowledge of God. (The worshipers are those begotten out of the Spirit, 3:6.) The Father himself desires such worshipers, since he is "Spirit." (This thought can be justified by Is. 31:3 in the Hebrew but not in the LXX text, the one generally used by the New Testament authors.) Direct statements declaring God to be Spirit in essence are found in Stoic philosophy, and it seems probable that the formulation given Jesus' words by the author was influenced by knowledge of such. The woman now states that she knows that the Messiah, the one called Christ, is coming. (In the native Samaritan texts, the Messiah is called *Taeb,* "Restorer.") He will proclaim everything to them when he comes. This remark gives Jesus the opportunity to declare unequivocally, "I am (the Messiah)—the one who is speaking with thee." This "I am" saying differs from those we shall meet in 6:35 etc. for the implied predicate, Messiah, is not a figure of speech.

vv. 17–30 At this point the disciples arrive. They are surprised to find Jesus conversing with the woman, but out of a sense of awe ask no questions. The woman leaves her water jar standing, goes to the city, and invites the people to come out and see whether the man who showed such supernatural knowledge about her affairs was not the Christ. The people of the city thereupon went forth to him. That, however, is ignored in the sequel and their coming to him is subsequently mentioned again (v. 40)—an indication that this section is composite.

vv. 31–38 Jesus meanwhile (aware of the coming of a crowd) rejects the urging of the disciples to eat; he asserts that he has a food to eat of which they do not know. They are as obtuse in understanding his figurative speech as was the woman in 4:11. Jesus explains that to do the will of God and complete his work is his food. He reminds them of their saying that the harvest will come in four months. (According to the Palestinian agricultural calendar, this implies that the words were spoken at the end of January or beginning of February—long before Passover—suggesting that the story was not originally connected with a return from a Passover celebration, but was placed here artificially from a different context.) Jesus bids them lift up their eyes prophetically, as he is doing, and see the fields white for the harvest. (The word "already" at the end of v. 35 is generally drawn to the beginning of the next verse.) This is an allusion to the color of the ripening *wheat* (which is whitish, while barley is yellowish). The Palestinian barley harvest starts about the middle of May; the wheat harvest, about the first of June. Already (cf. the comment above) the reaper takes pay (for his day's work) and gathers fruit unto everlasting life, in order that sower and reaper can rejoice simultaneously. (So quick is the process of growth!) Actually, however, the reaping is a bit farther off. This is made plain by the continuation: "Here (too) the words (of the familiar saying) apply (but in different sense): "One sows and another reaps." Jesus has sent the disciples to reap what was not the product of their toil; others (the prophets and he himself) have labored, and they (the disciples) have entered into their (well-cultivated field of) labor. It sounds as though this were formulated by the author with an eye to a younger generation of missionaries than the disciples.

vv. 39–42 Many Samaritans of that city who were now coming out to the Well of Jacob already believed because of the testimony of the woman. When they reached Jesus they asked him to stay with them, and he spent two days in "Sychar." (What a contrast the despised Samaritans provide to Jesus' own people of whom it was said "His own did not receive him, 1:11.") As a result many more believed on account of his "words" and declared to the woman that they were now believing of their own accord from hearing and not merely because of her speaking. They utter the confession that they know "this one truly is the savior (Gr. *sōtēr*) of the world." With this resonant keynote the story terminates. The Messianic idea is lifted to a new level with the aid of a phrase provided by Hellenistic Roman imperialism; for the Roman emperors, too, took the title "Savior of the world."

B. JESUS IN GALILEE, JERUSALEM (2ND JOURNEY) AND AT THE SEA OF TIBERIAS
4:43–6:71

4:43–54 The Healing of the Son of a Royal Official (Sign II). After two days (hence, on the meaningful "third day"; cf. 2:1) Jesus left for Galilee. A peculiar reason is given: that he himself testified "that a prophet had no honor in his own country" (cf. Mk. 6:4). In this passage Jesus is apparently regarded as a Judaean, who now emigrates to Galilee. He is received in friendly manner by the Galileans owing to the "signs" he had done at Jerusalem, which the Galilean pilgrims had seen and reported. That, indeed, fits a first visit (cf. the repeated emphasis on coming into Galilee, vv. 47, 54). Whatever the view of the author of this particular source, the evangelist thinks of Jesus as a Galilean (1:45; 7:41, 52).

Jesus goes to Cana, "where he made water into wine" (2:1 f.). This seems peculiar, since the story that follows concerns a man living in Capernaum. We have already observed a tendency in this Gospel to "play down" the connection with Capernaum (2:12), and here we see a fondness for Cana confirmed (cf. on 2:1). A royal (Herodian) official at Capernaum who heard that Jesus "had come out of Judaea into Galilee" went to him and asked that he come down and heal his dying son. Jesus complains that unless they (i.e., the Jews) see signs and wonders they will not believe (cf. 1 Cor. 1:22). When the official, addressing him as Lord, begs him to come down before his son dies, Jesus bids him go (home), declaring that his son lives. The word "Lord" gave indication that he had a faith antecedent to seeing miracles. The man believes the word Jesus speaks to him, and departs. When he is already going down (to Capernaum) he meets servants, who tell him that his son is alive. On inquiring which hour his son grew better, he learns that the fever had left him on the preceding day at the seventh hour (1:00 P.M.)—the very hour in which Jesus had given his assurance of healing. As the distance between Capernaum and Cana by the shortest route was sixteen miles or more, the man could have made it from Capernaum to Cana by 1:00 P.M. if he started in good season. He might even have returned home the same day, but his firm faith made that effort unnecessary. He and his whole house became believers—the first Christian family of Capernaum (according to this Gospel).

The story is clearly a variant of the healing of the servant of the centurion of Capernaum (Mt. 8:5–13; Lk. 7:1–10). It is closer to the Matthean form because the man goes in person to Jesus. Since he here is not a soldier but a royal official, and not a Gentile but a Jew, certain elements of the Synoptic story do not appear in this version. The final words, "This again Jesus did as second sign, in coming from Judaea into Galilee," presupposes the recent migration of Jesus, and indicates that this story in some previous form of the Gospel material followed closely on the first sign, 2:1–12. Since, in Lk., the centurion goes to meet Jesus before he enters Capernaum, it is tempting to suppose that the story was once connected with the Capernaum visit of 2:12. However, in its present form it presupposes a considerable distance between Capernaum and the point where the royal official appealed to Jesus. In the earlier version Jesus may have been described as doing more traveling after the visit to Capernaum, and as returning to Cana.

5:1–47 The Healing of the Lame Man at the Pool of Bethesda (Sign III)

5:1–9a The Narrative. The evangelist has used an old story of the second, more elaborate type, describing a miracle done at Jerusalem. In the Synoptic Gospels no miracle-working is mentioned in connection with Jesus' only visit to the city.

v. 1 The opening verse is purely editorial to establish a connection. It is a question whether one should read, "After these things there was *a* festival of the Jews," or "*the* festival of the Jews." The latter reading would mean the Passover; those who are of the opinion that ch. 6 once stood before ch. 5 prefer it, in view of the fact that the Passover was in prospect in 6:4. In the present order of the material, however, the indefinite "a festival" (such as Pentecost) is better; otherwise an additional year is added to the ministry of Jesus.

vv. 2–4 We learn here of a pool of Bethesda (A.V. following late manuscripts). In the best manuscripts the name is given as Bethzatha, and that can hardly be separated from the name of the suburb Bezatha (a name capable of diverse philological explanations) that had grown up north of the city (cf. Jos., *B. J.*, *5*, 4, 2, etc.). It seems probable that eastern Christians of the author's time had given the place (rather than the pool) a commemorative name, owing to what Jesus had done there, calling it "in Hebrew" (= in Aramaic) *beth-ḥesdā* (so the Old Syriac version), "house of the mercy (of God)," which passed into Greek transcription as Bethesda. The pool lay near the sheep gate (which was north of the Temple, but east of the Antonia fortress) and had five porticoes. If the remains of a *double* pool found by archaeologists in the indicated locality are those of Bethesda the number of porticoes becomes more understandable. In the Copper Scroll from Qumran, describing where treasures were buried, there is mention of a "House of (two?) Pools" —perhaps a reference to this very same place. In these porticoes lay a crowd of the sick—blind, lame, paralyzed persons (the latter only in Codex D and Old Latin).

The final words of v. 3 (A.V.: "waiting for the moving of the water") are found only in late texts. V. 4, elaborates on this, but like the uncertain elements of v. 3, is missing in Codices S, B, C, and the Old Syriac. However, this material is required in order to explain v. 7. Its omission could be due to reluctance to accept what it states, and the uncertainties of text in the verse itself merely mean that it was not carefully guarded, once it had been omitted. Its antiquity is attested to by Tertullian *c.* 200. The verse states that an angel of the Lord (cf. the angel of the waters, Rev. 16:5) went down from time to time and stirred the water. Then the first one who entered became healed of whatever disease he had. A natural phenomenon—periodic disturbance of the water—was interpreted supernaturally by the people. (This is a known phenomenon of the Pool of Siloam in the south; perhaps the story was originally localized there, rather than in the northern suburb.)

vv. 5–9a There was a man there "having (counted) thirty-eight years in his illness." Jesus (whose going to the place—perhaps on his way into the city—is not specifically related) sees him lying there, and knowing (supernaturally) that the man already has (counted) much time (in illness) asks him whether he wishes to become well. The invalid, addressing Jesus as "Lord," explains that he has no man to cast (i.e., hurriedly get him into) the pool when the water is stirred. When he comes (slowly and laboriously), another goes down (into it) ahead of him. Jesus now bids him arise, take up his pallet and walk about (cf. Mk. 2:9). The man does as he is told and thus is healed.

5:9b–18 The Sabbath Controversy

vv. 9b–13. It was not said that the healing took place on the Sabbath. But the evangelist finds it useful to bring in that idea here belatedly, under stimulus of Mark 3:1–6 and perhaps a general knowledge of the role of Sabbath controversy in the ministry of Jesus. He thus declares that it was a Sabbath and that "the Jews" (rather strange where all people were Jews) pointed out to the man the impropriety of his carrying his pallet (presumably on his way home). He explains that the one who healed him had told him to do so. He was, however, unable to name his healer, for Jesus had departed immediately because of the crowd at the place. (This suggests a desire to remain unknown, and lends some support to the idea that 7:2–10 once preceded 5:2; its removal would have necessitated the creation of 5:1.)

vv. 14–16 Jesus later meets the man in the Temple and commands him to sin no more lest something worse happen to him. This is a belated bringing forward of the thought that is central in Mk. 2:1–12. The man (who, it is assumed, now learns the name of his healer) departs and tells it to "the Jews." For this reason the Jews "persecuted" Jesus (some texts, in view of v. 18, add "and sought to kill him"), because he had done these things on the Sabbath.

vv. 17–18 At this point there seems to be a gap, for Jesus "answers them" without anyone's having said anything. The Sabbath theme is still at issue. Jesus declares that his Father has worked continuously and that he himself also works, thereby evidently claiming that God's resting on the Sabbath (Gen. 2:1 f.; Ex. 20:11; 31:17) did not exclude necessary activities, and taking to himself as the Son the exceptional right, yea the duty, to act (cf. 9:4). The Jews now sought *the more* to kill him, not only because he broke the Sabbath, but because he called God his (own) Father, making himself equal (Gr. *ísos;* cf. Mt. 20:12) to God.

5:19–47 The Judgment Discourse

5:19–30 The Revealer as Judge. It is possible that the piece 7:21–24 once had a place in this context, since it concerns the healing here done and the Sabbath controversy here involved. Perhaps the author replaced it with something else at this point, and then used it in ch. 7.

vv. 19–26 Jesus, thereupon, addresses them, setting forth his relation to the Father: (1) With an Amen-saying he declares that the Son can do nothing of himself that he has not seen the Father do; he imitates him exactly. (2) The Father, in his love for the Son (3:35), shows him everything he does and will show him greater works than these (which the Son then will also emulate) to their astonishment. (The greatest work of God is the quickening of the dead, Deut. 32:39.) As the Father raises and reanimates the dead, so the Son reanimates whom he wills (cf. 11:43–44). (3) The Father does not judge anyone, having entrusted all judgment to the Son, in order that all may honor the Son, as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him.

v. 24 In another Amen-saying Jesus states that whoever hears his word and believes the one who sent him, has enternal life and will escape the judgment, passing directly from death to life.

vv. 25–27 Still another Amen-saying asserts: The hour is coming *and is now* when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear (it) shall live. For as the Father has life in himself so he has also given to the Son to have life in himself (v. 27). It would seem from the *"is now"* in v. 25 that the dead here are the spiritually "dead" (cf. Mt. 8:22) and that Jesus is already engaged in awakening them and granting them eternal life as a present possession (3:15, 16; 6:40, 47, 54; 10:28).

vv. 27–29 The author continues by having Jesus say that God has given him authority to carry out the judgment because he is the Son of man (Dan. 7:13). This is apparently meant in the sense of 3:19. [They are not to wonder at this, for the hour is coming in which all in the tombs will hear his (the Son of man's) voice and those who did what is good (= what is true, 3:21) will go forth to the resurrection of life, and those who did what is evil (3:20), to the resurrection of judgment.] Some scholars consider this material of vv. 28–29 and the similar allusions below to have been added later, in the interest of harmonization with the older apocalypticism from which the author had emancipated himself (see p. 266). Others hold it to be a relapse into traditionalism by the author.

v. 30 Jesus can do nothing of himself (cf. v. 19). He judges as he has heard (God judges). His judgment (i.e., verdict) is just, for he seeks not his will but that of the one who sent him. Here the thought seems to be of present judgment rather than of an eschatological one.

5:31–40 The Witness of the Father. Jesus has made bold statements. The question now is: What witnesses can he bring forward, for among the legalistically minded Jews, the matter of supporting witness was essential. He admits that if he bears witness about himself, such witness is not true (i.e., cannot be regarded as establishing the truth according to legal custom; cf. 8:13). There is another who testifies concerning him (i.e., the Father; cf. vv. 34, 36), and he knows this testimony is true. They (the Jews) sent to John the Baptist, and he testified to the truth (i.e., about Jesus, 1:15, 24 f.). But he does not accept human testimony, and is only mentioning it that they might (perhaps be influenced by it since they esteemed John so highly, and) be saved.

This allusion to the Baptist gives occasion for a digressive remark about him. (V. 35 thus being in effect a counterpart to Mt. 11:7–11.) John is now a figure of the past. In a vivid metaphor he is described as having been a burning and shining lamp. (He was that, though not the light, 1:8.) They wished to rejoice for an hour in his light (but not to repent).

But Jesus can adduce greater testimony on his own behalf than John's: the works the Father gave him to complete (4:34), the very works which he is doing, bear witness that the Father has sent him. And the Father himself bore witness concerning him (1:33). His hearers have not (like the ancients) heard God's voice or seen his form (Ex. 19:19; 24:17) and (even) his Word they do not have abiding in them (cf. 1 Jn. 2:14, 24), for they do not believe God's messenger, Jesus. They search the Scriptures, thinking to have eternal life in them. The Scriptures (being divinely inspired) are those bearing witness concerning him. And yet they (the Jews) do not want to come to him to have life.

5:41–47 Jewish Unbelief. Jesus asserts that he does not accept "glory" (i.e., praise, honor; cf. v. 44; Rom. 2:9–10) coming from men (and hence is not seeking it, though they ought to give it), but he knows his hearers as such who have no love of God in themselves (such as Scripture demands; Lk. 11:42). He has come in his Father's name, but they do not receive him. (Love of God would lead to acceptance and honoring of God's messenger.) If someone else will come in his own name (i.e., unauthorized by God), they will receive him (allusion to a Jewish pseudo-Messiah?). How can they believe while (bent on) taking glory (= praise) from one another and not seeking the glory coming from the only God? Let them not think (however) that he will accuse them before God. (This seemingly loses sight of the thought that he himself is the Judge, 5:22.) Their accuser is Moses in whom they hope. For if they believed Moses, they would believe Jesus, since Moses wrote about him (in Messianic prophecies of the Pentateuch). If they do not believe his writings (which are their highest authority), how will they believe Jesus' words?

6:1–15 The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Sign IV; cf. Mk. 6:30–44; Mt. 14:13–21; Lk. 9:10–17). The opening statement, "After these things Jesus went away across the sea," does not connect satisfactorily with Ch. 5. In view of 7:3–4, scholars are inclined to believe that ch. 6 originally stood before ch. 5. "After these things" would then have applied to the sign of the healing of the son of the royal official, 4:46 f. If the latter met Jesus near Capernaum rather than near Cana as in the present text, then the lake crossing would follow very naturally. In the present arrangement the story stands disconnected.

The designation "sea of Galilee (the one) of Tiberias," if not a combination of two variants, takes cognizance of the fact that there was another lake in Galilee (L. Semechonitis, in the *Ḥuleh* region). Tiberias was the capital of Herod Antipas, built on the southwestern shore of the lake in 26 B.C. and named for the emperor Tiberius. The rabbis, too, speak of the sea of Tiberias, and likewise Josephus (*B. J., 3,* 3, 5).

The point of departure apparently was Capernaum (vv. 17, 24, 59). Jesus was followed by a crowd eager to see signs of healing, though how this was possible is not made clear, as it is in Mk. 6:32–33. On arriving at the eastern shore, he ascended a mountain and seated himself with his disciples. This is apparently symbolic of his prophetic or Messianic status (cf. Elijah, 2 Kings 1:9, LXX; Mt. 5:1). At this point we are told that the Passover, "the feast of the Jews," was near; this, however, is not part of the received story, but has been injected by the evangelist because the coming Passover gives the proper background for the thoughts that he wishes to raise in the minds of the readers. If ch. 6 originally preceded ch. 5, this was meaningful.

Seeing a big crowd coming, Jesus was immediately concerned about feeding them. He asked Philip, by way of trying him (i.e., to see whether he had faith in his ability to work wonders)—for Jesus knew what he wanted to do—whence they could buy bread that these might eat. Philip's answer was only an estimate of costs: two hundred denarii worth would not suffice for each one to have even a little. (In Mk. 6:37, it would suffice.) One of his disciples, Andrew "the brother of Simon Peter" (cf. 1:40), gave more useful information: there was a boy present who had five barley loaves (coarse, inferior bread) and two fishes, but what is this among so many? (One must not ask where the boy comes from, or how he can be in possession of this provender, but his mention is curious, since it is not found in the Synoptic version. Cf. the boy who appears mysteriously at sacramental occasions in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.) Jesus commanded the disciples to have the people recline; the mention of much green grass at the place must have a purpose. Perhaps prior to addition of the Passover remark in v. 4, it gave the indication of the season of the year. The *men,* as in the Synoptic parallels, numbered five thousand. (Some leeway is thus left for women and children; cf. Mt. 14:21.) John does not, however, dwell on the niceties of the group arrangement as do the Synoptics. Jesus took the bread (the mention of breaking is omitted, perhaps as self-evident), gave thanks, and distributed it to those reclining (through agency of his disciples?), and did likewise with the fishes, whatever (i.e., as much as) they wished. Then he commanded them to gather the remaining fragments that nothing might perish. (In the Synoptic Gospels this was done without command of Jesus.) They gathered twelve baskets of fragments (from the bread, no mention of the fishes; cf. Mk. 6:43). On seeing the "sign" Jesus had done, the people uttered the confession, "This one truly is the prophet that is coming into the world." The underlying story thus does not go beyond the thought that Jesus is the predicted "prophet like Moses" (cf. Deut. 18:18). However, the story steps out of line with this when the evangelist relates that the people were about to seize Jesus to make him king. Apparently the evangelist combined coming prophet and coming Messiah here (though not in 1:20–21). Jesus, knowing their intention (by dint of superior knowledge), departed again to the mountain alone.

6:16–21 The Sign of Walking on the Water (Sign V; Mk. 6:45–52; Mt. 14:22–33). Without such a directive as Jesus gives them in Mk. 6:45, the disciples, as the evening arrived, went down to the sea and started to cross over to the western shore. It became dark and Jesus had not yet come to them (i.e., as a matter of course, they expected him to join them miraculously), and the sea was made turbulent by a strong wind. When they had rowed about twenty-five to thirty stadia (three or four miles), or about half the width of the lake, they saw Jesus walking on the sea and drawing near the boat. We have already observed in connection with the Synoptic parallels that this walking on the water is a manifestation of the divine nature of Jesus ("Epiphany"), which he assumed again after the resurrection. The disciples were frightened, but he said to them, "It is I, be not afraid." Then they wanted to take him into the boat, and immediately the latter was (miraculously) at the land toward which they were heading. The motif of the boat traveling with miraculous speed, which is used here, stimulated the imagination of the authors of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (especially those of Andrew and Philip, the two mentioned in the story of the Feeding).

6:22–29 The Crowd Follows to Capernaum and Is Instructed

vv. 22–27 The following morning the crowd standing at the other side of the sea (they had evidently camped there overnight) saw (= realized that) no other boat (had been) there except one, and that Jesus had not gone into the boat with his disciples, but that these had departed alone. Boats from Tiberias approached the place "where they had eaten the bread, with the Lord giving thanks." When the crowd saw that Jesus as well as the disciples were gone, they went aboard the boats (five thousand people?) and came to Capernaum seeking Jesus. When they found him at the shore of the sea, they asked him how he had arrived there. With an Amen-saying he answered that they were seeking him not because they had seen signs (pl., including the feeding and his mysteriously getting to the other shore), but because they had eaten from the loaves and had been sated (and were hoping for more such feedings). He exhorted them to labor not for perishable food, but for the food that abides to everlasting life (cf. the living water, 4:10 f.), which food the Son of man (who is from heaven, 3:13) will give them, for him the Father has "sealed" (i.e., endowed with heavenly power, not just "confirmed," as in 3:33). In vv. 22–27 we have a counterpart to Mk. 6:54, but instead of the people on the western shore greeting Jesus, those who had experienced the miracle are brought to the scene.

vv. 28–29 The evangelist has in all probability created this piece to serve as a connecting link between vv. 22–27 and the next block of material. The hearers ask Jesus how they should go about doing the works of God. (Cf. 4:34 where such doing is compared to eating food.) He tells them that the works of God which they are to do are but a single one: to believe in him whom God has sent.

6:30–51b The Bread of Life Discourse

vv. 30–31 The hearers now ask Jesus what sign he does (= can do) that they may see and believe in him. They refer to the manna their fathers had eaten, quoting the Old Testament allusions to "bread from heaven" (Ps. 78:24; Ex. 16:4). They thereby hint that Jesus should give them bread from heaven. It seems strange that this is spoken by the very people who have just experienced the miracle of the feeding. Taken by itself, however, as not originally composed to follow 6:1–29, the utterance is understandable if one bears in mind that, as rabbinic sources show, there was an expectation of a renewed giving of manna in the Messianic times (cf. also Rev. 2:17).

vv. 32–35 Jesus now attaches spiritualizing instruction to the mention of the bread of heaven. Moses did not give them such bread (it was only earthly bread, cf. v. 49), but his Father is (now) giving them the true bread from heaven; for the bread of God is the one who is descending (= has descended) from heaven and is giving (eternal) life to the world. The hearers, who do not understand the subtle meaning of the reply, say "Lord give us this bread always" (cf. 4:15). Thereupon Jesus declares "I am (Gr. *egṓ eimi*) the bread of life." The one who comes to him will never hunger and the one who believes in him will never thirst (4:14). This "I am" saying is one of some thirteen of the predicative type. (Contrast the type without a predicate, 8:24 etc.)

vv. 36–40 The opening verse is controversial, since it does not connect well either with what precedes or with what follows. It apparently serves to sharpen the conflict. Jesus has already told them (reference to v. 26? or, as vv. 30–35 imply?) that though they had seen (him?) they had not believed. (But the word "me" is missing in important manuscripts. The object implied is probably "the sign.") Taking up the thought of v. 35 (that the one who comes to him will not hunger) he declares that everything (= everyone) that the Father has given Jesus will come to him and that he will not reject it (= him); i.e., the divine will brings him his followers. He has come from heaven to carry out the will of him who sent him; that will is that he should not lose anything of what he (God) gave him [but that he should awaken it on the last day. For this is the will of his Father, that every one who beholds the Son and believes in him shall (in the future) have eternal life and that he should raise him on the last day]. (The bracketed allusions to the resurrection of the dead in vv. 39 and 40, as well as below in 44 may have been added later on the basis of v. 54.)

vv. 41–46 The Jews murmur about his claim of being the bread that came down from heaven. (But this claim does not come until v. 51a, for which reason some scholars think vv. 41–46 should be transposed to a position after v. 51b.) They ask whether this is not "Jesus son of Joseph," (the identity of) whose parents they know. How then can he say that he is descended from heaven? Jesus urges them not to murmur among themselves. No one can come to him unless the Father who sent him draws him (Jer. 31:3; Song of Sol. 1:4); [and he (Christ) will awaken such a one on the last day]. It is written in the Prophets, "And they will all be taught of God" (Is. 54:13). Everyone who has heard from the Father (what he says of the Son) and has learned (i.e., understands it), comes to Jesus. Not that anyone has ever seen the Father (1:18); only he who is from God (namely Jesus) has seen the Father.

vv. 47–51b The main thread, broken off with 6:34, is now resumed with an Amen-saying, that whoever believes (in him) has eternal life. He is the (true) bread of life. Their fathers ate manna in the wilderness and died. This (bread he is speaking of) is the bread that comes down from heaven, in order that anyone may eat of it and not die (i.e., that whoever eats of it may not die). In repetitious statement, this is driven home. He is the living bread that descended from heaven. Who eats of it will live forever.

6:51c–59 The Eucharistic Discourse. The last statement of v. 51 belongs with what follows, not with what precedes. Jesus says that the bread which he will give on behalf of the life of the world is his flesh (Gr. *sarx*). This is a shift in symbolism; previously he himself was the bread, but now he becomes the giver of the bread. The thought here is inspired by the distribution of bread at the Lord's supper—it is not merely a general reference to the crucified Christ.

The remark of v. 51c leads the Jews to dispute with each other: How can this one give us his flesh to eat? With an Amen-saying Jesus declares that unless they eat the flesh and blood of the Son of man (the traditional term used without special emphasis), they will not have (eternal) life *in themselves.* (The partaking of the heavenly food thus brings into one's body the potentiality of eternal life.) He who does so, will have it (i.e., life in himself) [and Jesus will raise him up on the last day]. (If the whole piece was added editorially the bracketed remark may be authentic here.) His flesh and blood are true (Gr. *alēthēs,* "dependable," "trustworthy") food and drink, and of the one who eats and drinks thereof, he says, "He abides in me and I in him" (i.e., the state of sacramental partnership is achieved; contrast the partnership with the demons, 1 Cor. 10:20). This is the bread that descended from heaven; it is not like the manna which the fathers ate and (which had no effect on their natures so that they) died. He who eats this bread lives forever.

It is one of the strange peculiarities of this Gospel that it does not relate the institution of the Lord's Supper, which is so firmly supported by oldest ecclesiastical tradition in 1 Cor. 11:23 f. Perhaps this evangelist thought of the Supper as more than an incident of the Passion story. It is to him a Christian mystery, analogous to those of the Hellenistic mystery-religions. A little later (*c.* A.D. 116), Bishop Ignatius of Antioch calls the Lord's Supper "a magic means (Gr. *phármakon*) of immortality." This thought is approximated here in that of having life in oneself in consequence of partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ (v. 53). However, the main emphasis seems to be on the abiding presence of Christ in the believer (v. 56), which is experienced only through faith. The harsh terminology of the passage (cf. especially the Gr. verb *trṓgō* for "eat," used of animals or of the eating of fruits and vegetables) reflects the strong antithesis of the author to the heresy of Docetism (see p. 268).

v. 59 This was apparently the conclusion of the Bread of Life discourse, prior to the interpolation of the Eucharistic discourse. Rather surprisingly, since no change of situation was mentioned after v. 25, we learn here that Jesus spoke his teaching in the Capernaum synagogue. (Cf. 1:28; 8:20 for similar concluding localizations.)

6:60–65 The Separation among the Disciples. Many of Jesus' disciples declare this (v. 51) to be a hard saying and ask who is able to hear it (i.e., accept it). Aware of their "murmuring" about this, Jesus asks them: Does this (already) give them offense? How will it be when they see the Son of man ascending to where he was at first (i.e., to heaven from the cross)? It is the Spirit that is life-giving (2 Cor. 3:6); the flesh profits nothing. The words Jesus has spoken to them are Spirit and life. But there are some of them who do not believe. Faith alone can appreciate the power of these words he has uttered. (Does this refer to the words of the Eucharistic discourse? The allusion to the flesh profiting nothing, v. 63, places that in doubt, for the flesh of Christ evidently profits a great deal. However, the allusion to the hard saying was certainly focused on v. 51. The flesh of Christ is on a different level from the human flesh meant in the possibly proverbial saying of v. 63.)

By way of explanation, the evangelist adds that Jesus with his supernatural knowledge (2:25) knew from the first that there were some who were not (truly) believing, and knew also who his betrayer would be (cf. v. 70–71, 18:4). The evangelist quotes a saying of Jesus that on this account (in view of the unbelievers in the larger group of disciples as well as the one in the smaller group) he had said to them that no one could come to him except it is given him by the Father. (He puts true discipleship under the idea of predestination; cf. 6:37, 44, 45.)

6:66–71 Peter's Messianic Confession (cf. Mk. 8:27–33; Mt. 16:13–23; Lk. 9:18–22). A crucial point is thus reached in the ministry of Jesus, when the Eucharistic discourse introduces the idea of the crucified Christ. As Paul says in 1 Cor. 1:23, this message is a stumbling block to the Jews. Many now "went to the rear" and no longer walked about with Jesus. This leads Jesus to confront the Twelve (who have not been mentioned before and occur again only in 20:24) with the question whether they too wished to go away. (This is considerably removed from the situation and from the question of Mk. 8:27 f.) Peter replies, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life. And we have believed and have realized that thou art the Holy One of God." (The last words are a phrase stemming from the Synoptic tradition, cf. Mk. 1:24; Lk. 4:34, and there meaning the Messiah, but here are used in a higher sense; cf. 10:36, "the one whom the Father hallowed and sent into the world.") This then is John's version of Peter's Messianic Confession.

The reaction of Jesus is completely changed from that of Mk. 8:30 and parallels. Jesus asks: "Did I not elect you as twelve? But one of you is a devil"—meaning Judas (son) of Simon Iscariotes. (This supplies the name of Judas' father, and attributes the designation Iscariotes to him rather than to Judas; but cf. Mk. 3:19.) The evangelist adds "for this one was going to betray him—*one of the Twelve.*" In Mk. 8:33 Peter is called "Satan," an item deleted by Luke. Here the equivalent Greek designation is transferred to Judas. The author implies a warning. If among those whom Jesus chose there was one whom the divine predestination did not fully bring to him (cf. v. 65), how much more must the Christian reader or hearer be on his guard to make sure that he is not in the same class.

C. JESUS IN JERUSALEM (3RD JOURNEY)

7:1–10:39

7:1–52 Jesus at the Feast of the Tabernacles

7:1–13 The Decision Not to Go and Its Reversal

v. 1 After these things Jesus went about in Galilee, for he did not wish to go about in Judaea because the Jews were seeking to kill him. This sounds like the opening sentence of an account of the Galilean ministry of Jesus. It fits with 4:43–45—that peculiar piece of material presupposing that Jesus originally carried on a ministry in Judaea, but then went to Galilee. However, the continuation disappoints the reader's expectation.

vv. 2–4 "There was near the feast of the Jews" (so designated because not celebrated by Christians?), the Tabernacles or Booths (Heb. *Sukkōth,* Lev. 23:34, celebrated at the time of the autumnal equinox). The brothers of Jesus (who suddenly appear on the scene, having last been mentioned in 2:12) urged him to go to Judaea in order that they [his disciples] may see the works he does. (When "his disciples" is recognized as a mistaken interpretative addition, the meaning becomes clear: he is to go so that "they" (i.e., *the Judaeans*) may see his works.) The brothers point out to him that no one does anything in secret if he seeks to be "in openness" (i.e., seeks public prominence). Since Jesus has been doing such (great) things, let him show himself to the world. (This can hardly be regarded as ironical. The brothers mean what they say, and have his success at heart. Galilee is an obscure corner of the land—to receive attention one must go to Judaea, especially, of course, to Jerusalem.) The assumption of the words is that Jesus has hitherto labored exclusively in Galilee; the opposite idea is entertained in v. 1 and in 4:43–45. Such inconsistencies invite critical solutions (see p. 266).

vv. 5–6 A parenthetical remark adds, "For even his brothers did not believe in him." (The brothers apparently believe in his Messiahship and are encouraging him toward that goal. But for the evangelist this is not the faith Jesus sought; cf. 6:15.) Jesus rejects the suggestion of his brothers because his time (Gr. *kairós*) is not yet come. *Their* time is always ready (i.e., for leaving. We would say: they can leave at any time). The world is not able to hate them (since they do not oppose it, and so they can move about freely in it), but it hates him because he bears witness concerning it that its works are evil. (Hence he must wait with going to Jerusalem until his time comes, when he is prepared for martyrdom.) He bids them go up to the feast. He is not going because his time is not yet fulfilled. A concluding remark notes that, saying these things to them, he remained in Galilee.

vv. 7–10 After the departure of the brothers, Jesus went to Jerusalem (alone), and not openly but in secret. Just as he reversed himself in 2:1–11 after declaring that his hour had not yet come, so he does here. Jesus waits for the divine prompting, which can completely change his attitude of the moment.

vv. 11–13 The Jews were seeking Jesus at the festival, asking, "Where is that one?" There was much "murmuring" about him among the crowds; some said he was (a) good (man, cf. Lk. 23:50, but apparently avoided by Jn. in this case); others said, "Nay, but he deceives the people." But no one spoke freely about him out of fear of the (leaders of the) Jews. This material is much like that of 11:55–57 and may have been patterned after it. It presupposes that Jesus has carried on a ministry in Judaea and is known there. As this disagrees with the viewpoint of vv. 2–4, while agreeing with that of v. 1, we obviously have before us in this chapter some materials that are at cross purposes. The author or editor has not digested them in a manner to create a unified composition.

7:14–18 Jesus Defends Himself against Attack with Respect to His Education

v. 14 When it was already about the middle of the (seven-day) festival, Jesus went up into the Temple and taught. This statement is extremely unsatisfactory in view of what he said to his brothers in v. 8 and the incognito assumed in v. 10. We must realize, however, that the author or editor is mainly concerned with providing Jesus with opportunities to deliver revelatory pronouncements, and that for his taste it was probably a fine thing to have him throw off the incognito and appear boldly in the Temple. External matters interest him so little that he does not even have Jesus meet his brothers and explain how he had come to change his plans.

vv. 15–18 The material contained in these verses was apparently not composed for this connection but belongs with ch. 5. (It could have stood after 5:47.) The situation is that of the initial teaching of Jesus. There was astonishment: how can this one know the Scriptures without proper education? Jesus, thereupon, declares that his teaching is not his own, but that of him who sent him. Whoever does God's will (as expressed in this teaching) will soon recognize its divine origin. (The following general rule bears witness in his favor:) He who speaks from himself seeks but his own glory, but he who seeks the glory of God is truthful and free from unrighteousness. (That is the case with him.)

7:19–24 Jesus and the Law of Moses

vv. 19–20 Jesus here assails his opponents. Did not Moses give them the law? None of them obeys it. (The law says: Thou shalt not kill.) Why are they seeking to kill him? This elicits the reply that he has a demon (cf. 8:48 f., 52; 10:20; also Mt. 11:18; Lk. 7:33). Who, they ask, is seeking to kill him? They thus deny their evil intent, but with his supernatural knowledge he discerns it. This piece seems to have no real inner connection with what follows. The fact that the law of Moses is mentioned in both pieces may be responsible for their being linked together.

vv. 21–24 This clearly belongs with ch. 5, since it refers to the healing miracle done there. It could have stood after 5:16. The author or editor wanted to have Jesus give two discourses at the festival, and in order to get subject matter for this first one, he utilized material that had been prepared for the situation of ch. 5. Jesus declares that he did one deed (only, 5:2–9), and that they all marveled. (It is too much to assume that the same people who saw the deed done at a previous festival could be present six months later. "Ye all" in v. 21 evidently applies to the Jerusalemites in general.)

Jesus answers their charge about performing the healing on the Sabbath thus: Moses (as Pentateuchal author) gave them circumcision (a statement he unnecessarily corrects to assertion of its patriarchal origin, Gen. 17:10), and they circumcise a boy on the Sabbath (if it happens to fall on the eighth day; Lev. 12:3), thus breaking one law to uphold another. Why, then, should they be angry with him who made a *whole* man well on the Sabbath (not just a *part* of a man)? Circumcision is here viewed as having a healing effect (taking away uncleanness?). Let them not judge according to "seeing," but according to what is just.

7:25–30 Jesus Recognized. This piece evidently belongs to the older stratum of ch. 7. It follows well on v. 14, when Jesus appears in public. Some of the Jerusalemites ask whether this was not he whom they (i.e., the leaders) are seeking to kill. Here he is speaking openly, yet they say nothing to him. Do the leaders truly think that this one is the Messiah? (This is quickly dismissed as improbable.) They know whence he is (cf. 1:45–46; 7:52), but no one will know whence the Messiah is, when he comes. (The birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem was thus not held necessary.) Jesus, teaching in the Temple (and knowing supernaturally what they were saying; cf. 2:24–25), calls forth aloud that they know him and know whence he is. He has (however) not come from himself (i.e., self-appointedly), but the one sending him, whom they do not know (i.e., God), is true (Gr. *alēthinós,* but here in the sense of *alēthḗs,* 3:33). Jesus knows him because he is from him, and was sent by him. (They thus have by no means excluded him as possible Messiah by knowing where he grew up.) The evangelist here adds that (though this infuriated the hearers) no one could lay a hand on him (miraculous prevention, as in Lk. 4:30?), for his (predestined) hour had not yet come (7:6; 8:20; 13:1).

7:31–36 Where Is Jesus Going?

vv. 31–32 Many (thereupon) believed in Jesus, saying: "Can the Messiah do more signs than he has done?" The Pharisees heard the crowd murmuring about him, and acting in concert with the high priests sent servants out to seize him. (One expects immediate action, but this is lost sight of until v. 45, several days later.) This parallels the attempted seizure by the people in v. 30 and hence vv. 31–32 cannot be the original continuation of vv. 25–30, just as vv. 33–36 cannot be the original continuation of this piece.

vv. 33–36 This is perhaps best viewed as secondarily added to the above vv. 31–32. Jesus declares that he is yet with them (only) a short time and is (soon) returning to him who sent him. They will seek him and not find him, and where he then will be, they will not be able to come to (cf. 8:21; 13:33). The Jews, failing to comprehend, ask one another where he is about to go. Is he going to the dispersion of the Greeks to teach the Greeks (i.e., the Gentiles, prophetic as in 11:51 f.)? What does he mean by the remark of v. 34?

7:37–52 The Last Day of the Feast

7:37–38 The Occasion and the Proclamation. Another appearance of Jesus in public is put "on the last day, the great one of the feast." The eighth day is called "the good last day of the festival" in rabbinic sources, and this corresponds rather well to the language of v. 37. However, this last day was often taken as a separate festival (Lev. 23:36; Num. 29:35: called *'Aṣereth*). Some find in the adjectival phrase, "the great one," reason to identify it with the seventh day, on which there were particular festive doings such as the procession of the priests around the altar. If Jesus "stood and cried out" (translation of a Hebrew phrase found in rabbinic texts and also underlying in Rev. 18:18), he evidently sought the attention of a crowd in the Temple. If he said, "Let whoever thirsts come to me and drink," some interpreters find that suggested by the water-libation ceremony, which was repeated on every day of the festival at the morning sacrifice with water carried from the Siloam spring. (There is doubt, however, as to whether the libation was brought on the eighth day.)

v. 38 The continuation of v. 37 is not easy to understand with certainty. It is rather ungrammatical: "The one believing in me, as the Scripture said, rivers of living water will flow from his body" (literally "belly"). An explanatory remark is added that Jesus said this about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for not yet was there Spirit (present), since Jesus had not yet been "glorified" (i.e., crucified and ascended to heaven). Rivers of blessing will flow from the body of the believer in Christ when the Holy Spirit is poured out. The figure of speech is a bold one and is probably derived from pictorial representations of river gods. Basically the author is thinking of what Joel 2:28–29 predicts, even if some source unknown to us and expressing the thought differently were in his mind.

7:39–44 Further Discussion about Jesus by the People. Once more we get the reaction of the crowd with divided sentiments (cf. 7:25–30, 31–32). Some say he is in truth "the prophet" (cf. 1:21, 25); others, he is the Christ. Still others point to the impossibility of the Christ's coming from Galilee, and recall the requirements of Davidic lineage and birth at Bethlehem. (The author thus is unacquainted with the traditions of Mt. 2:1 f.; Lk. 2:4 f.) So there was a division (Gr. *schísma*) in the crowd on account of him. Some wanted to seize Jesus, but no one laid (i.e., was able to lay?) hands on him.

7:45–52 Jesus Defended by the Servants Sent to Seize Him and by Nicodemus. This hangs together with vv. 31–36, and like that passage probably represents secondary expansion of the text by author or editor. The servants of v. 32 return to the high priests and Pharisees, and report that no one has ever spoken as does this man. Thereupon the Pharisees suspect that they, too, have been deceived, and scornfully ask them whether any leading men or any Pharisees believe in Jesus? As for the crowd, ignorant of the law (and contemptuously called *'Am hā-āreṣ* "people of the land" in rabbinic sources), they are accursed (as shown by their being misled so easily by Jesus). Nicodemus (3:1 f.) here interposes an objection to judging a man without a hearing and an investigation of his actions. He receives a rebuke: Is he from Galilee that he speaks thus (out of sympathy for a fellow countryman)? He is advised, furthermore, that no prophet arises in Galilee. (This remark disregards the fact that prophets had arisen there, cf. 2 Kings 14:25, but reveals the excitement and prejudice of the speakers.)

The Pericope of the Adulteress
7:53–8:11

This remarkable narrative appears at this point in Codex D and in many late manuscripts, but is missing in such leading codices as S, A, B, C, W, and in the Old Syriac. Sometimes it is found at the end of the Fourth Gospel, as a kind of appendix. In the so-called Ferrar group of manuscripts (see p. 9), it appears after Lk. 21:38, where, however, it does not fit. A remark of Papias, quoted by Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 3,* 39 seems to indicate that it was derived from the apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* of which we have only fragments excerpted by Church Fathers. As its text was not so carefully guarded, the manuscripts show a process of accretion in the direction of making an elaborate story out of an originally brief one.

The opening statement concluded a previous incident (perhaps Lk. 20:19–26 = Mk. 12:13–17). Everyone goes home while Jesus goes to the Mount of Olives, where he presumably camped out for the night (cf. Lk. 21:37; 22:39). The event related takes place on the following day in the Temple, where Jesus is teaching the people. (That he "sat down" in teaching is not mentioned elsewhere in Jn.) Scribes and Pharisees bring a woman to him that had been caught in the act of adultery. The woman was evidently being taken to a court sitting in the Temple (not to execution, for a court decree already handed down would no longer be subject to discussion, and would have to be carried out). The law of Moses, they assert, prescribed stoning such. (This is mentioned only in the special cases of Deut. 22: 20–21, 23–24, but in practice was evidently the customary manner of inflicting the death penalty for adultery ordered in Lev. 20:10; Deut. 22:22. One misses mention of the guilty man, for whom the same penalty applied.) They ask Jesus: "What does he say?" (The comment, "this they said trying him, that they might have something to charge him with," is not found in all texts.) Jesus bent down and wrote with his finger on the ground (doodling, to show disinterestedness in the legal problem? Cf. Lk. 12:14). When they persisted with their question he straightened up and said, "Let the sinless one of you, as first one, cast on her a stone." Then he bent down again to write. Having heard the saying, they went away one by one, beginning with the eldest, and Jesus was left alone with the woman in the midst (of the imaginary circle). Straightening up again, Jesus asked her, "Woman, where are they? Does no one condemn thee?" She replied, "No one, Lord" (thus addressing him with the title of Christian faith). He said that neither did he condemn her, and ordered her to go and henceforth sin no longer.

The story provides one of the most beautiful illustrations of Jesus' mercy, as contrasted to the cruelty of the self-righteous. One can understand that a narrative of this nature was not too pleasing to churchmen bent on church discipline. Adultery was a far more prevalent sin in the Hellenistic-Roman world than among the Jews. Combating it required rigorous measures. For that situation the attitude of Jesus seemed too mild. Hence there is silence all along the line about this narrative on the part of Church Fathers, except Eusebius.

8:12–59 Further Discourses in the Temple

8:12–20 The Witness Jesus Gives for Himself is Disputed and Defended

v. 12 The opening formula indicates that this piece has been put here editorially. Jesus "again spoke to them, saying" that he is "the light of the world"; the one who follows him will not walk in darkness but will have the light of life (according to 1:4, the light that is of the life that is in the Logos). The keynote thus struck is not followed out, however, but there are materials below and elsewhere which continue it (cf. 12:44–50; 8:21–29; 12:34–36) and which exegetes bent on reconstructing a supposed earlier discourse on Light are able to use for the purpose.

vv. 13–18 The Pharisees reject Jesus' witness on his own behalf (according to the present sequence, his declaration of v. 12). They say it is not true. He maintains that if he bears witness about himself it *is* true, because he knows whence he came and whither he is going (cf. 3:13 f.; 6:33 f.; 7:28, 33). They judge "according to the flesh" (i.e., on a carnal level); Jesus (at present) judges no one (having come to save, 3:17) but if (and when) he judges (as will be the case in the future, 5:22) his judgment will be "true" (= real, as it ought to be), for he is not alone (in such judging)—he and the one who sent him (are together). In the Mosaic law (Deut. 17:6) it is written that the witness of two men is (considered) true. (Here also there are two.) He testifies for himself, and the Father who sent him testifies for him.

The Jews ironically ask who his father is. Jesus replies that they know neither him nor his Father; if they knew *him,* they would also know the Father.

The author states that Jesus spoke these words at the "treasury"—no doubt the chamber in the Court of the Women, near which also were the receptacles for various kinds of offerings (cf. Mk. 12:41 f.). No one seized him (cf. 7:30, 32, 44) because his "hour" (in 2:4) had not yet come.

8:21–30 The Bringer of Authoritative Revelation

vv. 21–24 Another opening formula indicates editorial placement of what follows. Jesus takes up the thought touched upon in 7:34. He is going (to heaven) and they will seek him (in vain) and "die in their sin." (A Hebrew phrase underlies; cf. "die in one's guilt": Jer. 31:30; Ezek. 3:19; but "in sin": Ezek. 18:24, and in rabbinic parallels.) Where he goes they cannot come. The Jews thereupon say (to each other): "Is he going to kill himself?" (The thought of suicide was chiefly entertained by revolutionists in the event of failure, to escape a worse fate. Is his case similarly desperate?) Jesus declares that they are from below, "of the world," while he is from above and not of the world. They will die in their sins (v. 21) unless they believe that "I am he" (Gr. *egó eimi,* really *"I* am"). The LXX so renders Heb. *anī hū,* "I am he" (cf. Is. 41:4; 43:10, 25; Deut. 32:39). The saying implies supreme self-assertion, i.e., that he alone is the Son and messenger of God.

vv. 25–30 They then ask Jesus who he is (cf. Rom. 9:20). He replies with a rhetorical question: "Why do I speak to you at all?" (If this rendering is correct—there are other possibilities—it expresses despair at having to respond to such an inquiry.) He has many things to say *about* them and to judge (in the future, cf. vv. 15–16). But the one who sent him is true (i.e., speaks the truth) and he (Jesus) speaks in the world what he has heard from the Father (namely, the truth). The Jews fail to understand that he is speaking of the heavenly Father. He then declares that when they have "lifted up" the Son of man (on the cross) they will realize that "I am he" (cf. v. 24) and that he does not do anything from himself (i.e., on his own authority), but speaks these things as taught by the Father. He has not left Jesus alone, because Jesus at all times does what is pleasing to him. A concluding comment of the author indicates that when he spoke these things, many believed in him (cf. 4:39; 7:31; 12:42).

8:31–59 The Discourse on Descent from Abraham

vv. 31–32 Jesus here allegedly speaks to the Jews who have believed in him (with an eye to those referred to in v. 30). If they (faithfully) abide in his word, they will really be his disciples and will know the truth (brought by him) and the truth will make them free (i.e., give them inner independence over against the world and its pressures that tend to separate man from the heavenly sphere).

vv. 33–36 The continuation does not sound like words of "believers." If the connection is not artificial, one must assume that the degree of faith presupposed in vv. 30–31 is very slight. The hearers fail to understand the freedom that is meant, and quibble about this word. They reply that they are the seed of Abraham and have never served anybody (politically? or socially? Lev. 25:39 f.?). How can he say that they will become free? With an Amen-saying, Jesus declares that whoever does sin is a slave [of sin]. The slave does not abide in the house forever, but the son remains forever. (While this sounds proverbial, he is thinking of the Son of God and of his Father's house.) If then the Son liberates them from sin they will really be free (and can remain in the house). The saying would be clearer if the reference to sin, bracketed above, were glossatory.

vv. 37–47 Jesus knows that they are (as they claim) the seed of Abraham. Yet they are seeking to kill him (this hardly fits the believing Jews of v. 31), because his word does not make progress in them. *He* speaks of that which he has seen (when he was) with the Father; *they* then do what they have heard from the (i.e., their very different) father. When the Jews reassert their descent from Abraham, Jesus says that if they were really his children they would do the works of Abraham. But now they are seeking to kill him, a man (= one) who has spoken to them (only) what he had heard from God. Abraham did not do this (i.e., act thus). They are doing the work of their (real) father (cf. v. 44). The Jews (interpreting this as denial of descent from Abraham, in spite of v. 37?) affirm that they were not born out of fornication (where paternity is dubious), but that (if he is speaking of other than physical descent) they have one Father, namely, God (Mal. 2:10). Jesus replies that if God were their Father they would love him (Jesus), for he has gone forth from God and is come (into the world according to God's will). For not has he come from himself (i.e., on his own initiative) but he (God) has sent him.

He then asks why they do not understand his speech? Answering for them, he says that they are incapable of hearing his word (i.e., his heavenly message). Bringing out into the open what was veiled in v. 38, he charges that they are of their father the Devil, and it is his desires they wish to do (i.e., kill and lie, as the next statements show). The Devil was a mankiller (1 Jn. 3:15) from the beginning (of history, in so far as he brought death to men; Gen. 3; cf. Wisd. of Sol. 2:24) and in the truth he does not stand (i.e., is not firm) because the truth is not in him. When he speaks what is false, he speaks out of his own things (i.e., his nature) because he is a liar (1 Jn. 1:10) and the father of it (i.e., of all lying). Because Jesus speaks the truth, they do not believe him. (They are thus willfully evil-minded, for his veracity is unimpugned.) Who of them can convict him with respect to a sin? If (as is patent) he speaks the truth why do they not believe him? (It is because they are of the Devil!) He who is out of God hears the Word of God, but they do not hear because they are not out of God.

vv. 48–59 The Jews, angered by his words, ask if they do not rightly say that he is a Samaritan and has a demon (inside him)? (The Samaritans were detested as virtually on a level with heathen, but it is obscure why demon-possession is so closely linked with them here. Perhaps the author is thinking of the followers of Simon Magus, who were accused of worshiping demons; cf. Eus., *Eccl. Hist., 2,* 13.) Jesus does not reply to the first part of the question, but denies that he has a demon. He honors his Father, while they dishonor Jesus. He seeks not his own glory, but there is one who seeks (it) and judges (those who dishonor him). With an Amen-saying he assures them that anyone who keeps his word will not "see" death forever.

The Jews declare that they now know he has a demon. Is he greater than their father Abraham who died and (greater than) the prophets (who) died, when he speaks of not tasting death forever? What does he make himself (to be)? Jesus replies: If he glorifies himself his glory is nothing. It is the Father who glorifies him (cf. 13:32; 16:14; 17:1–5). They call him their God, but do not know him. Jesus knows him and would be a liar as they are if he denied it. He knows him and keeps his Word. Abraham their father (puts them to shame, for he) rejoiced (a reinterpretation of Abraham's laughter, Gen. 17:17, which is also found in Philo) that he should behold his "day" (i.e., the Messiah's future coming), and he saw it (i.e., in Paradise; cf. Lk. 16:22–31), and was glad. The Jews reply ironically: "Thou art not yet fifty years old (cf. Num. 4:3) and hast seen Abraham?" With another Amen-saying, Jesus declares to them that before Abraham was, he (Jesus) "is" (hint of his pre-existence; cf. 1:1). This seemed blasphemous to the Jews, and as a blasphemer was subject to stoning, they lifted up stones to throw at him (Lev. 24:16). But Jesus concealed himself (miraculously; cf. 10:31, 39; 12:36; Lk. 4:30) and left the Temple. (Stoning in the Temple precincts was not in accord with Jewish law, which prescribed taking a person outside of the "encampment" or city; cf. Lev. 24:11 f.; Acts 7:58).

9:1–41 The Healing of the Man Born Blind (Sign VI)

9:1–7 The Miracle

vv. 1–3 This tale is of the elaborate kind, and like Mk. 7:36–37, represents Jesus as resorting to healing techniques after the manner of other ancient wonder-workers. Indeed it is another version of the same incident merely transferred to a different locality. It begins with Jesus' "passing by" (cf. Mk. 2:14), which is hardly the word expected in the change of locale from 8:59, and so must have stood in the source used. He allegedly saw a man "blind from birth." The disciples (lost sight of since 6:66–71) ask: Who sinned—the man or his parents—that he was born blind?" (The underlying assumption is that misfortune such as this is the result of sin. The idea of imputing sin to a child before birth is peculiar, but has rabbinic parallels, in which deduction from Gen. 25:22 plays a role.) Jesus denies that sin is the cause of the man's affliction; rather, he was made blind that the works of God should be revealed (i.e., in his being healed).

vv. 4–5 He adds: "It is necessary that *we* do the words of him that sent *me*" (read *"us"*; cf. 3:11, or else instead of previous "we" read "I"). The continuation "while it is day, for a night is coming, when no one is able to work" does not seem particularly suitable as a saying of Jesus, and sounds as though it were derived from a proverb which stressed the urgency of one's working while there was yet time. It is used here to suggest the brevity of Jesus' stay on earth. As long as he is in the world, he is the light of the world. (He cannot be in the world without exercising his function.) Those who would reconstruct a Light Discourse regard 9:4–5 as derived from it.

vv. 6–7 We now regain the substance of the older story, in which spittle—ever a magic agent—plays a role. Jesus spat on the ground, made a "dough," applied it to the man's eyes, and bade him go and wash himself in the Pool of Siloam (Heb. *Shilōaḥ,* south of the Temple, in the city valley). The author translates the name as "the one sent." He finds this prophetic of Christ as the one sent by the Father. (This does not satisfactorily explain the name, which really means "the sending," i.e., the channeling of water from a spring; cf. Is. 8:6.) One must assume that the man was guided to the pool by others. On washing himself, he "came (home) seeing."

9:8–12 The Man Explains to the Neighbors. Presumably the received story said something about astonishment at his healing, but the author elaborated on this in his own peculiar way with a dialogue. There is a debate among neighbors and those who had seen him as a beggar as to whether he was really the one who had sat begging. The man has to identify himself and explain how his eyes were "opened." He makes no reference to the spittle, but merely says Jesus made a "dough" and "anointed" his eyes, etc. When they ask where Jesus is, he says he does not know.

9:13–17 The Man Brought before the Pharisees. The evangelist saw an opportunity here to bring in the Sabbath-conflict idea, which is so important in the older tradition. He thus mentions belatedly that the healing had taken place on the Sabbath, and has the man taken to the Pharisees. The beggar gives a short account of his healing by Jesus: "He put dough on my eyes and I washed myself and (now) I see." Some thereupon declare that Jesus is not from God because he does not keep the Sabbath; others ask: "How can one who is a sinner do such signs (he must therefore be sent by God)?" There thus was a division (7:43) among them. Speaking to the man again (after this discussion among themselves), they ask him what he thinks of Jesus. He replies, "He is a prophet" (cf. 4:19).

9:18–23 The Man's Parents Questioned. There is reason to believe that the evangelist here has expanded the story, for the healing was accepted as a fact in vv. 16–17, and now suddenly is not considered established at all. Instead of the Pharisees, "the Jews" (i.e., the Jewish leaders) are mentioned. They doubt that the man was born blind, and (then) call the parents to substantiate the fact of his blindness at birth. The parents do so, but disclaim knowledge as to how (it is that) he now sees and who opened his eyes. Let them ask him, since he is of age. The evangelist explains their unwillingness to speak out as due to fear of the Jews, for the Jews had decided to cast out from the synagogue everyone who confessed Jesus as Messiah. (This does not fit the time of Jesus, but is an important testimony to the situation of the time of the Gospel.)

9:24–34 Further Questioning of the Healed Man. If vv. 18–23 are secondary, then v. 24a reporting the recall of the man must be also. The situation of v. 17 would then have continued with v. 24b—the interrogators urging the man to give the credit for his healing to God, since they know that Jesus is a sinner. (The speakers then are the proponents of the first view expressed in v. 16.) He disclaims knowledge about the latter point, but he knows one thing: He was blind and now can see. On being asked just what Jesus did, he says he has told them already and they did not listen. Why do they want to hear it again? Do they want to become his disciples? They thereupon revile him as Jesus' disciple, but claim to be Moses' disciples themselves. They know that Moses spoke with God, but do not know whence Jesus is. The man replies that in this (case) the astonishing (fact) exists that they do not know whence he is, and (yet) Jesus opened his eyes. "We know that God does not hear the prayers of sinners," but hears the one who is God-fearing and who does his will. From days of old it has never been heard that the eyes of one born blind were opened. If this man (Jesus) were not from God, he could not do anything (of this kind). The interrogators ask: "Does he, who was wholly born in sins (as shows by his being born blind), presume to instruct them?" They then drive him out (i.e., excommunicate him? cf. v. 23).

9:35–41 The Man Confesses Christ. Jesus heard that they had driven the man out, and finding him asked him whether he believed in the Son of man? He asked: "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe in him?" When Jesus declared, "Thou hast seen him and the one speaking with thee is he," the man said, "I believe, Lord," and prostrated himself in veneration. Jesus then states that he had come into the world to bring about a judgment (Gr. *kríma,* implying a division; cf. Mt. 25:31 f.) in order that those who *do not* see may see, and those who *do* see may become blind. (A revised version of Mk. 4:12?) The whole story is virtually an illustration of this saying. Some Pharisees that were with him heard this, and asked him whether they, too, belonged to the blind? Jesus replied that if they were blind they would have no sin (with respect to what requires sight). But now they say that they see; hence their sin remains. Cf. 10:19–21 as possible conclusion to this incident.

10:1–21 The Discourse of the Good Shepherd. Without any change of situation, a discourse of Jesus is appended to ch. 9. Some scholars hold that 10:22–30 originally preceded the Shepherd discourse.

Over against the false leadership of the Pharisees, the evangelist here emphasizes the true leadership of Christ. The figure of the shepherd was no doubt stimulated by the allegory of Ezek. 34, contrasting the Lord as the Good Shepherd with the evil shepherds or rulers of the people.

10:1–10 The Shepherd Comparison

vv. 1–6 With an Amen-saying, Jesus declares that the one who does not enter into "the hall of the sheep" by the door, but ascends (i.e., climbs over) from another side is a thief and a robber. The one entering through the door into the "hall" is the shepherd, the doorkeeper opens for him, and the sheep hear his voice. He calls his (own) sheep (in the corral sheep of diverse shepherds are combined for the night) and the sheep hear his voice, and he calls his own sheep by their names, and leads them forth. When he has driven out all his own, he goes before them and the sheep follow him, since they know his voice. They will not follow another, but rather will flee because they do not know the voice of the others. Jesus spoke to them the "figure" (Gr. *paroimía,* cf. 16:25, 29, used instead of the Synoptic word "parable" in this Gospel), but they did not understand what he was saying to them (cf. Mk. 4:12).

vv. 7–10 This is apparently an extension, as indicated by the new opening formula, and is intended as interpretation of vv. 1–6. With an Amen-saying, Jesus says that he is the "door of the sheep." This is a surprising comparison: one expects rather that Jesus will call himself the shepherd (as he then does in v. 11, and since "door of the sheep" is an unnatural combination it seems probable that the text originally read *"shepherd* of the sheep." V. 8b presupposes that this comparison has preceded: all who came before him were thieves and robbers (a remark evidently applying to the recent line of Jewish teachers and perhaps also the Maccabaean high priests and kings), whom the sheep did not obey.

In v. 9, however, Jesus calls himself "the door" (without adding "of the sheep") and says that if anyone (i.e., any newly acquired sheep or believer?) goes in through him, he will be saved and will go in and out (of the fold day after day) and find pasturage. (Perhaps this verse was added as an afterthought, with the word *door* introduced in v. 7 to pave the way for it.)

In v. 10 the previous contrast between the true shepherd and the thief is continued. The thief comes to steal, kill, and destroy. Jesus came in order that they might have life and abundance.

10:11–18 The Good Shepherd

vv. 11–16 The shepherd versus thief contrast is replaced here by that of shepherd versus hireling. It is possible that this is a separately conceived piece which the author put here editorially. Jesus is the Good Shepherd and lays down his life (1 Jn. 3:16) on behalf of his sheep. The hireling, not being shepherd and (hence) not owner, sees the wolf coming and flees, forsaking the sheep, with the consequence that the wolf seizes (some of) them and scatters (the rest). This is because the man is a hireling, and does not care about the sheep. But Jesus is the Good Shepherd. He knows his own and they know him, just as the Father knows him and he knows the Father. And he gives his life for his sheep. (Hint of the Passion.) He has other sheep not of this (Jewish) fold and these he must lead; they will hear his voice and there will be just a (single) flock (not two separate ones as James and Peter had insisted; Gal. 2) and one shepherd. (The author has his eye on Gentile Christians and the single Church.)

vv. 17–18 In these verses we have a further commentary on the thought of v. 15b; on this account the Father loves Jesus (cf. 3:35), because he is laying down his life (of his own free will) in order to take it again. He declares he has power to lay it down and to take it again. (The view expressed here is peculiar to this Gospel; cf. 2:19, 5:26; otherwise it is God who raises Jesus from the dead.) This commandment (empowering him to act?) Jesus has received from the Father.

10:19–21 Reaction of the Hearers.

Again there was a "division" (cf. 7:43; 9:16) among the Jews on account of the words. Many declared him possessed of a demon and insane (cf. Mk. 3:21)—why listen to him? Others insisted that these were not the words of a demon-possessed man. A demon cannot open the eyes of the blind. This piece is certainly related to the story of ch. 9, to which it could have formed the conclusion.

10:22–39 Jesus at the Feast of the Dedication

v. 22 Jesus had come to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Tabernacles, but was still there when the Feast of the Dedication (Gr. *Enkainía,* Heb. Hanukkah) arrived. The evangelist notes that it was winter. This festival, which is not mentioned in the Old Testament Law, was introduced in 165 B.C. to celebrate the cleansing of the Temple after its defilement by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (cf. 1 Macc. 4:51–59). It was an eight-day celebration, beginning on the 25th of Kislev. (In A.D. 28 this lunar month began Dec. 7; in A.D. 29, Nov. 26.)

It was customary to have a light at the door of the house and to add another light each successive day. Josephus (*Ant., 12,* 7, 7) even calls the festival "the lights" (Gr. *phṓta*), and thinks the name was conferred on it "because this liberty beyond our hopes was given to us." Some think its mention in the Gospel gives the reader the impression that time is marching on and the final Passover drawing nearer.

vv. 23–30 Jesus was walking in the Temple, through the portico named after Solomon (cf. Acts 3:11), the roofed colonnade on the east side of the Temple precincts. The Jews surrounded him and asked, "Until when dost thou take our soul" (i.e., keep us in suspense)? If thou art the Messiah, tell us openly." Jesus indicated that he had told them but that they do not believe, though the works he does in the name of the Father bear witness concerning him. They do not believe because they are not his sheep (thus continuing the thought of 9:33 f.). In words again on the same plane as those of the preceding section (not transferred from there, but inspired by it) he dwells on the relation of shepherd and sheep, with the crowning assurance that he as shepherd gives his sheep eternal life, that they will not be destroyed forever and that no one will take them from his hand. His Father who has given (them) to him is greater (in power) than all, and no one is able to take (anything) from the hand of the Father. The logical difficulty that he first has said the same thing about himself as he here says about the Father is met by the declaration: For he and the Father are one. (This goes beyond such utterances concerning the unity of Father and Son as 5:19 f.; 8:16. In the background stands the idea of the divine nature of the Logos, 1:2.)

vv. 31–39 These utterances of Jesus lead again to a determination of the Jews to stone him (an intention then lost sight of; cf. 8:59). He replies that he has shown them many good works from the Father, i.e., authorized by God, and asks: For the sake of which work among these would they stone him? They reply that they are not stoning him because of a good work, but because of blasphemy and (= in particular) because he, a man, was making himself God. Jesus asks whether it was not written in their "law" (here used in extended sense for Scripture, as in 12:34, 15:25, for the reference is to the Psalms): "I said you are gods" (Ps. 82:6)? If God calls those "gods" to whom the Word of God came (i.e., was directed)—and the Scripture cannot be broken (7:23, as it would be if this were denied)—then (how can) they say, "Thou blasphemest," to him whom God has hallowed and sent into the world, (merely) because he says he is the Son of God? He urges them not to believe him if he does not do the works of God; but if he does them, they should believe the works, even if they do not believe in his person, in order that they may realize and know that the Father is in him and he in the Father.

This was just as objectionable to his hearers as what he had said before (10:30), and they again sought to seize him, but he "went forth" from their hands (miraculously? cf. 8:59; Lk. 4:30).

D. JESUS IN PERAEA AND JERUSALEM (4TH JOURNEY) 10:40–12:50

10:40–41 Jesus in Peraea. A brief narrative element creates fresh interest. Jesus went to the area beyond the Jordan, where John had baptized previously (1:19 f.), and stayed there. (This removal from the Jerusalem scene was necessitated by the requirements of ch. 11.) Many came to him (there) and said that (while) John did no "sign," all the things he said about this one (Jesus) were true. And many believed in him. (This reflects recruitment from the ranks of the followers of the Baptist; perhaps a projection back to the time of Jesus from the days of the early Church.)

11:1–57 The Awakening of Lazarus and its Consequences (Sign VII)

11:1–6 The Message of the Illness of Lazarus. The evangelist here utilizes a received story of the elaborate type (see p. 20 f.), but to restore its pristine form is difficult (cf. p. 306). There are many traces of expansion. Instead of being a point of departure for a revelatory discourse, reflective elements have been introduced directly into it.

vv. 1–2 There was a certain man who was ill—Lazarus of Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha (cf. 12:1 f.). This affirms no relationship between Lazarus and the sisters, therein agreeing with 12:2 and also with Lk. 10:38 f., where no brother is mentioned. Since in Luke Jesus is traveling in a region far from Jerusalem the home of the sisters was imagined as being elsewhere. We must assume, then, that in the re-established Jerusalem of the evangelist's day, Mary and Martha have been given a Bethany domicile. (This is not surprising if one observes that even the visions of the risen Lord could be transferred to Jerusalem from Galilee.) A further remark (v. 2) links Mary with the woman of Mk. 14:3 f. and makes Lazarus her brother. We thus see tradition growing right before our eyes. The resultant development was pleasing to nascent asceticism in that it provided the picture of a man and his sisters living in ideal fellowship.

vv. 3–6 The sisters send word to Jesus, addressing him as "Lord," that "he whom he loves" is ill. Jesus declares that the illness is not unto death (i.e., with death the divinely intended end) but on behalf of (Gr. *hyper,* 6:51) God's glory (namely:) in order that the Son of God be glorified through it. (As the real glorification of Jesus is attained by his crucifixion, according to this evangelist, the point is that this occasion will have important bearing on the events; cf. 11:45 f.) The evangelist here adds that Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus (in v. 3 it was Lazarus whom he loved, and Martha was secondary to Mary in v. 1). According to the present story, Jesus does not take any action but remains two days where he is.

11:7–16 The Decision to Go to Judaea; Warning and Submission of the Disciples

vv. 7–10 Thereafter on the third day (chosen for its symbolism) Jesus expresses the desire to start back to Judaea, with Jerusalem obviously in mind. The disciples remonstrate: Had not the Jews just tried to stone him (10:31)? He replies with the counterquestion: Has not the day twelve hours? (Similarly, is not the length of life's day fixed by God?) If one walk by daylight he will not stumble because he sees the light of this world (i.e., the sun); if he walk by night he stumbles because the light is not in him (i.e., received into oneself by the act of seeing). The point seems to be that Jesus knows it is still daylight for him and that he can return to Judaea unharmed. (Cf. the similar idea in 9:4–5. Like the latter material 11:9–10 are also used by some for reconstructing a Light Discourse.)

vv. 11–15 Thereupon he informs them that Lazarus "our friend has fallen asleep," but that he is going (to Bethany) to awaken him. The disciples misunderstand this and say, "Lord, if he has fallen asleep he will be saved" (= get well). The belief that a sleep marks a turning point in an illness is thus presupposed here. Jesus now tells them that Lazarus is dead. He expresses gladness for their sake that he was not present (to heal him and prevent his death) in order that they may believe (by witnessing his awakening).

v. 16 Since the return to the vicinity of Jerusalem is risky, as v. 8 has already indicated, Thomas "the one called Didymos" (meaning "twin" in Gr., as Thomas, Aramaized Heb. *tĕōm* does) now speaks up bravely: "Let us go with him that we may die with him." This disciple (whose Gr. name is repeated also in 11:20, 24; 21:2) thus realizes that Jesus is now going to his death; the night of which Jesus had spoken (9:4) was nearing. The evangelist has substituted mention of Thomas for that of Peter in the analogous situation of Mk. 14:29. This is no doubt to awaken interest in him in view of the prominent role he gives Thomas in 20:24 f. It is understood that the others agree with Thomas, and are prepared for a common fate.

11:17–27 Martha Goes to Meet Jesus. When Jesus arrived (after a day's march involving an ascent of three thousand feet), he found him "having (= being, 5:5) already four days in the tomb." (This sounds like a scrap of the originally received story, which must have been short; it makes vv. 20–38 unnecessary.) The evangelist here notes that Bethany was fifteen stadia (1¾ miles) from Jerusalem. "Many of the Jews" (reflecting the mixed population of the author's time?) had come to *Mary and Martha* to comfort them. Martha, hearing that Jesus was coming, went out to meet him (4:51). Addressing him as "Lord," she declares that had he been here her brother would not have died, but she adds hopefully, "And now I know that whatever thou askest God he will give to thee" (cf. 9:31). Jesus thereupon predicts Lazarus will rise again, but she misunderstands this as referring to the resurrection on the Last Day. In correcting her, (and therewith the traditional eschatology which she expressed) Jesus in v. 25 speaks the words hallowed through Christian usage "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me though he die yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die."

This is another of those remarkable "I am" sayings (cf. 6:35; 8:12; 10:9, 11, 14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1, 5) which set forth the significance of Jesus, and are put into his own mouth for the most effective presentation. It is apparent that the emphasis is not on the first concept, but on the second: Jesus is the life. Through faith in him we have life in spite of death; living and believing, we are deathless: It is related to the saying of 8:51 "If anyone keeps my word he will never taste death." Through faith in Jesus, the life-quality, which Jesus has received so abundantly from the Father, flows into the believer and constitutes a deathless element in him, so that he never is utterly extinguished.

The promise is universal—but without faith it cannot be effective. Jesus therefore asks Martha whether she believes. She confesses that she believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God who is to come into the world (according to prophecy).

The thoughts expressed by Jesus really make the miracle of raising Lazarus unnecessary. The author goes beyond the horizon of the "historical" situation in the interest of instructing Christian readers, whose beloved dead will have to repose in their tombs without being called forth as Lazarus was.

11:28–37 Mary Called; the Jewish Visitors Follow Her. Martha then returns to the house and speaks secretly to her sister, who is with the company of v. 19. She tells her that the teacher is there and is calling her (the latter fact was not mentioned in v. 26). Mary arises quickly and comes to him. Jesus had not yet entered the village, but was at the place where Martha had met him. The visiting Jews follow Mary, thinking she is going out to the tomb to weep there. (The author has them do this, and in fact has introduced them into the story merely for the purpose of providing witnesses to the subsequent raising of Lazarus. Martha is lost sight of, but then apparently is present in v. 32 and resumes the active role in v. 39.) Seeing Jesus, Mary falls down at his feet (which Martha had not done) and weeps, speaking the same words Martha had in v. 21, though without the hopeful addition found in v. 22. (The whole scene, vv. 28–32, thus parallels vv. 20 ff.) The Jews that had followed Mary also weep. Jesus is angry in the spirit and excites himself (by suppressing his feelings?). He asks where they have laid Lazarus. They (the sisters?) bid him come with them and see. At this point he, too, weeps. (The prominence of the lachrymose element recalls Hellenistic romancing, which has similarly influenced the episodes of awakening of dead persons in the Apocryphal Acts of John.) Then the Jews remark, "See how he loved him." Some, however, ask whether he who had opened the eyes of the blind man was not able also to bring it about that this one should not die?

11:38–46 Lazarus Called Forth from the Tomb

vv. 38–41a Angered afresh (by such talk), Jesus comes to the tomb, a cave with a stone lying against it. He commands that they take away the stone. Martha, who raises objection, is introduced in a manner suggesting that she had not been mentioned before (a fact casting critical doubt on the originality of vv. 20–28). "Then said Martha, the sister of the one who had died, 'Lord, already he smells, for he is a fourth day (dead) one.' " But Jesus reminds her of his words (which, however, are varied from his utterances in vv. 25–26) that if she believed, she would see the glory of God (revealed in a happening). The stone is then removed.

vv. 41b–44 Jesus raises his eyes (heavenward) and utters a prayer, giving thanks to the Father for hearing him (for the reanimation of Lazarus already in process). He knows that the Father always hears him, but he has spoken (these words) for the sake of the crowd standing about, in order that they might believe that God has sent him. Having said this, he cries out with a loud voice, "Lazarus come forth." The deceased man issues from the tomb, hands and feet still loosely bound with bands, and a napkin (Gr. *soudárion,* cf. 20:7) wrapped around his face. Jesus directs that they should free him (of these hindrances) and let him go.

vv. 45–46 The original tale would naturally have ended with the acclaim of those who witnessed the miracle. A reflection of that ending is the evangelist's observation that many of the Jews who had come to Mary (note omission of Martha here; cf. v. 19) believed in Jesus when they saw what he did. He adds, however—following the pattern of his mention of division (cf. 7:43; 9:16; 10:19)—that some of them (i.e., of the Jews) went away to the high priests and told them what Jesus had done. (This is a transitional cleat by means of which the author can attach the next piece.)

The story which the author *received* was much shorter. Lazarus was the main figure in it. He was a resident of Bethany, unrelated to Martha and Mary, who, however, sent word to Jesus of his death. Jesus probably was described as coming immediately and raising him up. Some saying of public acclaim terminated it. This narrative was altered and expanded. Lazarus was made the brother of Martha and Mary; the retarding element of a delay in going to Bethany and the Passion-anticipation element, of the reluctance of the disciples to go, were introduced. Further additions were: the presence of Jews comforting the sisters; two parallel interviews with the sisters; the Jews following Mary to the scene of action; the objection of Martha to the removal of the stone from the tomb, and the reason for it; the public reaction to the miracle in its present form; and, finally, specifically Johannine discoursing by Jesus. The evangelist intensified the miraculous with the delay element and made the story particularly attractive to his women readers by giving Mary and Martha a sentimental role. He made the incident serve the purpose of causing the Passion, as the next piece shows.

11:47–53 The Decision to Put Jesus to Death. Thereupon, high priests and Pharisees convoked the Synedrium and put before it the question: What can they do, since this man does many signs? If they suffer him (to proceed) thus, all the people will believe in him, with the result that the Romans will come and take away from them (i.e., out of their control) "the place" (i.e., the Temple) and the people. A certain one of them, Caiaphas, "being the high priest of that year," addressed them. (Is the author mistakenly imagining an annual change of high priest, such as is known to have been customary with heathen high priesthoods in Asia Minor? But perhaps he is only placing an especial emphasis on the decisive year of Jesus' Passion; cf. the repetitions in v. 51 and 18:13.) Caiaphas charges that they know nothing, nor do they consider it better for them that one man die for the people than that the whole people perish. The evangelist adds the interesting comment that Caiaphas did not say this "from himself," but being high priest of that year, "he prophesied." (The underlying belief is that the deity sometimes makes the high personage the passive instrument of prophecy; cf. the instructive formula found in rabbinic sources, e.g., in the statement, "The daughter of Pharaoh prophesied and did not know that she was prophesying.") Caiaphas did not realize the full meaning of his words. His prophecy, the evangelist states, meant that Jesus was about to die for the people, and not alone for the people, but that the scattered children of God might be gathered into one (people). (This reflects the Jewish belief in the return of the Hebrew dispersion, but the thought has been sublimated to that of a united people of God, without any emphasis on race or nationality; cf. 10:16.)

A decision is thereupon taken to kill Jesus. Thus the miracle of the raising of Lazarus has become the occasion for the Passion. Unconsciously the Jewish leaders in their wicked and cynical planning are serving the divine purpose and Jesus' own intention to lay down his life (10:18).

11:54–57 Jesus in Retirement; the Order for His Seizure. Jesus no longer walked about openly in Judaea (lest the arrest come too soon), but withdrew to the country near the wilderness (i.e., the inclines to the Jordan valley), to a city named Ephraim (probably near Bethel, and hence north of Jerusalem), and stayed there with his disciples. But the Passover of the Jews was near, and many went up to Jerusalem in order to cleanse themselves (ritually for the feast). They looked for Jesus and asked each other, as they stood in the Temple, how it seemed to them, and would he not come to the festival? The author explains what might deter him: the high priests and Pharisees had given orders that if anyone knew where he was, they should report (it) so that they might seize him.

12:1–8 The Anointing in Bethany (Mk. 14:3–9; Mt. 26:6–13; cf. Lk. 7:36–38). Six days before the Passover (= five, if the counting be done in the Roman manner), Jesus returned to Bethany, where lived Lazarus whom he had raised. The time mentioned is apparently symbolical. Passover sacrifice was on the 14th of Nisan, and the lambs that were to be sacrificed were set apart on the 10th of Nisan. Since Jesus, for this evangelist, is the true Passover lamb, the scene that follows is evidently to be construed as his being set apart for sacrifice through the proleptic anointing.

A banquet was made for Jesus at Bethany (no mention being made here of the house of Simon the Leper; Mk. 14:3) and Martha "ministered." (Does this reflect Hellenistic-Christian deaconess activity? Jews held it improper for women to serve at a banquet.) Lazarus was one of those reclining (at table) with Jesus. Then Mary, taking a *lítra* (about a half-pint, but without mention of the alabaster jar of the Synoptics) of genuine, very precious oil of Nard (phraseology of Mt. 26:7), anointed the feet (as in Lk.; not the head, as in Mk. and Mt.) of Jesus, and dried his feet with her hair. (This element is derived from Lk. 7:38 and fitted better with the drying of tears. The large quantity of the oil used indicates the high honor accorded Jesus, cf. 19:39.) Whereas in the Synoptics "certain ones" (Mk. 14:4) or "the disciples" (Mt. 26:8) are displeased, the displeasure is here ascribed to "Judas the Iscariotes, one of his disciples" (an allusion that would scarcely seem necessary in view of 6:71; but cf. the repeated identifications of Caiaphas and Thomas) who was about to betray him. He asks why this ointment was not sold for three hundred denarii and (the money) given to the poor (almsgiving being the foremost of good works for pious Jews). The author notes here that Judas did not say this because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief, and having (custody of) the chest (Gr. *glōssókomon,* originally a box for mouthpieces of flutes; as loan word in rabbinic texts, *gelūsqemā* can mean money-box) was making off with what was cast (into it through a slot; cf. Mk. 12:42—apparently pious contributions for the poor). But Jesus commanded, "Let her alone that she may keep it for the day of my burial" (and then use it to anoint my dead body?).

The passage is surprising. The anointing of his feet was evidently only a *beginning* of the anointing of his body for burial. Unlike Mk. 14:8, the story looks forward to the completion of the anointing before burial, and thus belongs to a different version of the burial than that of 19:38–42. In it the Mary of Bethany had evidently been confused with "the other Mary" of Mt. 27:61. The concluding remark of Jesus that they always have the poor with them, but that him they do not have, may be a gloss based on Mt. 26:11; the verse is missing in Codex D and the Sinaitic Syriac.

12:9–11 The Crisis Foreshadowed. This short passage links up with 11:55–57. A great number of the Jews hearing that Jesus is there go forth (to Bethany), not only for his sake, but for Lazarus' (i.e., to see both). The high priests now plan to kill Lazarus, too, because on his account many of the Jews were "going away" (from the Jewish fold) and believing in Jesus. The idea of killing Lazarus is not pursued further. Perhaps the author is thinking of

Christian martyrdom, since the servant is not greater than his master (cf. 15:18 f.; 16:1 f.). The piece is transitional. Having interpolated the anointing story, the author must regain the standpoint of 11:55–57.

12:12–19 The Entry into Jerusalem (Mk. 11:1–10; Mt. 21:1–9), Lk. 19:28–38. "On the following day" (perhaps only an editorial link with the anointing story), the big crowd that had come to the feast (11:55?), hearing that Jesus was (at the point of) coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palms and went forth to meet him. (In Mark the crowd that came *with* Jesus strewed bunches of foliage.) Palm branches had to be brought from lower altitudes, since palms do not grow at Jerusalem. Victorious rulers were greeted with such, cf. Simon Maccabaeus on entering the Acra, 1 Mac. 13:51; victors of lesser dignity carried them (Rev. 7:9). The people are thus going forth to hail Jesus as victor, but in advance of any victory. Going out "to meet" an arriving high personage was customary then as now. Nothing is said here of a descent of Jesus and his disciples from the Mount of Olives. The crowd may only have gone forth from the gates.

(Seeing Jesus coming) they cry out "Osanna. Blessed the one coming in the name of the Lord, *and the king of Israel*" (cf. 6:15 and Lk. 19:38). Jesus, finding a "little ass" (Gr. *onárion,* diminutive of *ónos*), sat upon it, fulfilling Zech. 9:9. (The passage is quoted very freely and incompletely, yet with the basic "behold thy king cometh" and the substance of the rest, "seated upon the colt of an ass," preserved. The call to "rejoice" is changed to not to "fear.") Jesus thus acted to fulfill the prophecy on hearing himself acclaimed; he did not, as in the Synoptics, bring about the acclaim by arranging to obtain an ass. The evangelist represents the disciples as not understanding these things at first. However, when Jesus was "glorified" (i.e., after his crucifixion and return to heaven) then they remembered that these things were written of him and these (other) things they (i.e., the crowd) had done to him.

Then the crowd that was with him at the raising of Lazarus bore witness. For this reason the (new) crowd had gone out to meet him, because they had heard that he had done this sign. There thus seem to be three groups: (1) the Jews supposedly present at the miracle; (2) the crowd that went out to see Lazarus and Jesus, 12:9; (3) the crowd that went out to meet Jesus, v. 12. That of 12:9 is clearly secondary in origin, and the first group is evidently not imagined as numerous.

The testimony of the witnesses of the raising of Lazarus here serves a good purpose because it supports the acclaim given to Jesus and because it explains why Jesus could not be arrested (11:57 or, if that be a later element, 11:53). The Pharisees now said to each other, "You see that you profit nothing (6:63; i.e., with commands like 11:57). Behold the world has left (us) to follow him" (cf. 11:48). (This plaintive outburst shows the need for drastic action. The evangelist here may reflect contemporary Jewish chagrin that Christianity now was getting all the converts; Jewish proselytizing, once so successful, had greatly declined since the Jewish war of A.D. 68–70. This explains why the next incident is put here.)

Conclusion of the Ministry
12:20–50

12:20–26 Greeks Wish to See Jesus

vv. 20–24 Some "Greeks" (i.e., Greek-speaking proselytes) who had come to the festival approach Philip, who was from Bethsaida in Hellenistic territory and hence could speak Greek. Politely addressing him as "Sir," they express the desire to see (i.e., to make the acquaintance of) Jesus. He tells Andrew, who as first disciple has a special importance, and they both go to tell Jesus. (This reflects the fact that the Gentiles came to know Jesus only through the mediation of the Apostles. Both Andrew and Philip were evidently regarded as having been important missionaries in the area of chief interest to this evangelist; their relationship is like that of Barnabas and Paul; Acts 14:12.) Jesus sees in this request of Gentiles the signal that the hour has come for the glorification of the Son of man (through death and return to heaven). With an Amen-saying, he declares that unless the kernel of wheat falling to the ground "dies" (a thought shared by Paul; 1 Cor. 15:36) it remains alone (bringing no fruit). If it dies, it brings much fruit.

vv. 25–26 The Greeks are apparently lost sight of, for the author appends a discourse by Jesus. But since the theme is discipleship it may be regarded as an exhortation for them. The one who loves his soul (= life) loses it, the one who hates his soul in this world preserves it to (the objective of receiving) eternal life (cf. Mt. 10:39). Whoever would serve him should follow him (along the same road of giving up his life), and (then) where Jesus is, his servant will be. If anyone serves him, the Father will honor him.

12:27–33 The Submission of Jesus; The Heavenly Voice and Its Meaning

vv. 27–28 The passage 12:27 f. is evidently a substitute for the Gethsemane incident (Mk. 14:32 f.), which John could not well use after the high priestly prayer of ch. 17. Jesus declares that his soul now is troubled (11:33, with the natural fear of death). What shall he say? Shall he pray "Father save me from this hour"? But he rejects the thought because for that purpose (of dying) he has come into this (crucial) hour. His prayer—in contrast to that of Gethsemane, yet expressive of the deepest intent of the Gethsemane decision—is, "Father, glorify thy name" (in what is going to happen). That this is a particularly important juncture is indicated by the fact that now a heavenly voice (cf. on Mk. 1:11) comes, which declares with oracular obscurity, "I glorified (him before in his ministry on earth) and I will glorify (him) again" (by lifting him up on the cross and to heaven).

vv. 29–33 The sound of the heavenly voice is heard by the crowd and elicits a twofold reaction: some say it is thunder (cf. Ps. 29:3 f.); some, that an angel has spoken to Jesus. Jesus now declares that the voice came not for his sake, but for their sake. The judgment over the world (already in process of realization through his ministry 3:19; 5:22 f.) is taking place (i.e., being more fully realized) now (in his impending Passion). Now the ruler (Gr. *árchōn*) of this world (the Devil: 14:30; 16:11; cf. Lk. 4:6) will be cast out (from his bailiwick; contrast Lk. 10:18). But when Jesus is lifted up (on the cross and to heaven, 3:14; 8:28) he will draw all (men, including the Gentiles) to himself (6:44). The evangelist comments parenthetically that Jesus said this to indicate by what manner of death he was going to die (i.e., by elevation on the cross).

12:34–36 Controversy on the Messianic Idea

v. 34 The crowd asserts that they have heard (in synagogual reading of lessons?) that the law (= Scripture; 10:34) predicts that the Christ remains forever (e.g., Is. 9:6; Ps. 72:5; Ezek. 37:25). How can he say that the Son of man must be "lifted up" (to heaven)? Who is this Son of man?

v. 35 Instead of replying to this question, Jesus gives a concluding exhortation. The light (= he himself) will be among them for only a short time. May they walk about (in it: cf. 9:5; 11:9 f.) as long as they have it, lest darkness come over them, in which one cannot find the way (cf. 1 Jn. 2:11). Or, putting it differently: let them believe in the light (1:7 f.; 8:12 f.) while they have it, that they may become "sons of light" (cf. Lk. 16:8; 1 Thess. 5:5; Eph. 5:8. The heavenly world is light, and those who believe partake of its nature). One of the Dead Sea Scrolls bears the title "The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness." The Essenes of Qumran thus had the same world-view as is presupposed here.

After this speech Jesus departed and concealed himself as in 8:59. Some critics think that this piece originally was part of an earlier discourse on Light that supposedly began with 8:12, and to which 9:4–5 and 11:9–10, too, may have belonged (cf. also vv. 44–50).

12:37–50 Result of the Teaching of Jesus; Final Proclamation

vv. 37–41 Although he did many "signs" before them, the people did not believe in him (1:10). This was taking place in order that the word of Isaiah the prophet, who predicted such unbelief (Is. 53:1), might be fulfilled. And God (furthermore) was hardening the people's hearts to bring on judgment, as Isaiah again says (Is. 6:9–10; cf. Rom. 11:7;

Mk. 4:12). Isaiah could speak thus because he had seen the Lord's glory (1:14, 2:11) and had spoken about it. (The author identifies the Logos-Christ with the "Lord," Gr. *kýrios,* of Isaiah.)

vv. 42–43 Nevertheless, many of the leaders believed in him, but did not confess (their faith) on account of the Pharisees, lest they become excommunicated. For they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God. (More a reflection of Jewish-Christian relations of the author's time than of the time of Christ?)

vv. 44–50 A speech of Jesus is here given without mention of an audience (cf. v. 36) and hence is sometimes regarded as misplaced. It is basically a closing summary of his public teaching. He cried out (so that everyone should hear his message; cf. 1:15; 7:28, 37) the following: (1) Whoever believes in him believes in God, who sent him; the one who sees him sees God. (2) He has come into the world as light, whoever believes in him shall not remain in darkness. (3) He does not judge him who hears his words, but fails to keep them. For he did not come to judge the world, but to save it (cf. 3:17; 5:45). (4) The one who rejects him (cf. Lk. 10:16) and does not accept his words (however) has one who judges him. The (unaccepted) word which Jesus spoke, that will judge him (3:18) [on the last day]—the bracketed words probably being glossatory (cf. 6:39 ff.). (5) (His word is so important) because he has not spoken of himself; but the Father himself who sent him gave him the commandment as to what he should say and how he should speak. He knows that his commandment is (the means of) eternal life (for men). What things, therefore, he speaks, just as the Father spoke them to him, so he speaks them. (In a matter of such consequence the exact conveying of God's message was paramount.)

Because of allusion to light, this piece, too, is believed by some scholars to have belonged originally to a Discourse on Light (cf. at end of 12:35–36).

PART II THE RETURN TO THE FATHER
13:1–20:29

A. The Testament of Jesus
13:1–17:26

13:1–30 The Last Meal of Jesus and His Disciples

13:1–11 The Ceremony of the Washing of Feet

v. 1 (On the night) before the Passover (i.e., on the 13th of Nisan) when Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart (5:24) from this world to (go to) the Father, having loved "his own," the ones (who had to stay) in the world, he loved them (i.e., showed his love for them) to the utmost degree (in what he now did). (There is reason to believe that originally a narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper followed, which would indeed be an expression of love to the utmost degree. But in any case, the wording suggests that the occasion was symbolic of the early Christian communal meals called Agape, "love feast," with which celebration of the sacrament was associated.)

vv. 2–5 When the banquet was in progress, when already the Devil had cast (= put) it into the heart that Judas Iscariotes, (son) of Simon, should betray him (6:64, 71), knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands (3:35) and that he had gone forth from God and was going to God, Jesus arose from the banquet, laid off his (upper) garments and taking a linen cloth girded himself. (The allusion to Judas in v. 2 burdens the sentence unduly and was probably added as an afterthought; he himself here is given the surname in contrast to 6:71; 13:26.) He then carried out the washing of the feet of his disciples as described in v. 5. (It is strange that Jesus arises from the meal to perform this task; the time for the washing of feet is when the guests arrive. This is a good indication that the episode is artificially placed.) It was ordinarily left to the individual to wash his own feet unless the host had a slave whom he could command to perform this menial service. Jesus thus gives an example of self-abasement in humble service.

vv. 6–11 The story of the washing of the feet has been secondarily expanded here; its natural continuation is in v. 12. But the author wanted to have someone voice protest to this seemingly exaggerated self-abasement of Jesus (cf. Mt. 3:15), and Peter is the one singled out as spokesman. Peter is told that he does not know what Jesus is doing, but will know "after these things" (i.e., after Christ's death and resurrection; cf. 12:11. This clashes with the fact that the meaning of Jesus' action is subsequently given in vv. 12 f.) Peter says that Jesus shall never wash his feet, only to be told that unless Jesus washes him, he will have no portion (cf. Rev. 20:6) with him (in eternal life). Peter then wants to have more washing than of the feet—his hands and head too. But Jesus declares (v. 10) that the one who has bathed (before going out to a banquet?) has no need of being washed (on arrival) *except for his feet,* but (after these are washed?) is entirely clean. (There is much difference of opinion as to what v. 10 means, and the text itself is handed down with variations; the words "except for his feet" are particularly uncertain. Was Jesus speaking a proverb? Or is there a deeper meaning? Is the author thinking of baptism, for which the verb "to bathe" is sometimes used; cf. 1 Cor. 6:11? But this seems improbable, for one becomes clean through the word of Christ, cf. 15:3.) This is broadened in v. 10b to include the other disciples. They are clean, with a qualifying "but not all" added, which then requires the commentary that he knew the one who would betray him. (Some regard v. 11 as an addition, but it may be a kind of footnote by the author himself, for it is in his style.) The piece gives a preliminary interpretation of the ceremony, according to which the disciples must accept this service of Jesus in order to have a portion with him.

13:12–20 The Interpretation of the Act of Jesus. When he had washed their feet and taken (and put on) his garments he reclined again (at table). He asks the disciples whether they understand what he has done. They call him "the teacher" and "the Lord," and rightly so, for he is (that). If he, the Lord and teacher, washed their feet, they ought to wash the feet of one another. (That this was taken literally in parts of the early Church appears from 1 Tim. 5:10. Certain Christian sects still regard it as an obligatory ordinance of Christ; however, it has lost its meaning where men do not go barefoot or wear sandals.) He has set them an example, that as he did to them so they should do (to each other). With an Amen-saying he declares that a servant (slave) is not greater than his master, nor an emissary (Gr. *apóstolos*) greater than he that sent him. He hails as blessed those that know these things and act accordingly. The thought is continued in v. 20.

[**vv. 18–19** A qualification of what had just been said is made here—probably by the author himself who remembered that Judas was still in the company. But this anticipates 13:21 f., where the thought of Judas comes in. Jesus says he is not speaking (this Beatitude) about all, for he knows what (sort of) men he has chosen (2:25, and therefore that there is a traitor among them, whom he chose, not because of lack of discernment), but that the Scripture, Ps. 41:9 (quoted in a revised form and imagined as spoken by the pre-existent Messiah), might be fulfilled. He is now predicting his betrayal before it happens, that when it comes true they may believe "that I am he" (cf. on 8:24).]

v. 20 With another Amen-saying, the thought suggested by the emissary of v. 17 is carried further. He who receives them receives him, and he who receives him receives the one who sent him (cf. Mt. 10:40).

13:21–30 Designating the Betrayer. Saying these things, Jesus was troubled in spirit (11:33, 12:27), and with an Amen-saying declared that one of them would betray him. They looked at one another, being in doubt as to whom he was speaking about. Here is introduced a disciple whose name is not revealed (cf. 1:40?), but who is described as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." This is not to be interpreted sentimentally but rather as expressive of approval of his kind of discipleship (cf. 11:3, 5). The statement that he was "lying in the bosom of Jesus" (which A.V. renders "leaning on the bosom of Jesus") presupposes that the Hellenistic banqueting custom is being followed, and that the men are reclining on their left sides, eating with use of the right hand. They reclined on cushions or couches in groups of three with a low table in reach of each group. The first, or central couch was occupied by the leading personage. The unnamed disciple's head was opposite the breast of Jesus (owing to the recessed position of the third couch), while Peter behind Jesus, on the more honored second couch, which extended forward beyond the central one, was less favorably situated to ask him a whispered question. Therefore, he signaled this disciple to inquire as to the betrayer's identity. That individual (who had apparently raised himself to hear what Peter was saying) settled down (again) toward the breast of Jesus and asked: "Lord, who is it?" Jesus indicated that the man to whom he would give a morsel (of bread) which he had dipped (into the dish) was the betrayer. (Forks or spoons were not used; pieces of bread were employed to dip up and convey other food to the mouth. The action of the host in thus feeding a person was apparently a mark of favor or courtesy.) Dipping the morsel Jesus took (it) and gave it to Judas (son) of Simon Iscariotes who must have been at a nearby table. [After the morsel, then Satan entered into him (through the mouth? cf. 1 Cor. 11:29).] Jesus bade him do more quickly (than he intended) what he was (engaged in) doing. (He thus desired to get rid of Judas.) None of those banqueting knew why Jesus said (this) to him. Some thought that because he had the chest (12:6), Jesus had told him to buy what they had need of for the festival, or to give something to the poor. Judas then took the morsel (v. 27a, bracketed above, according to which he had already eaten it, thus may not be original), and immediately went out. The author notes that it was now night—a remnant of an older narrative and hardly to be allegorized.

The Farewell Discourses
13:31–16:33

Perhaps the final utterances of Jesus were orginally limited to what is reported in 13:31–35. The position of 14:31c would then have been shifted owing to the intrusion of further material in 14:1–31b. But a second discourse was then appended in 15:1–16:33. The two discourses, 14:1 ff. and 15:1 ff., are distinctive and of the same stamp. They are variations on two themes: the paraclete and the new coming of Christ. Both themes have a background in tradition. The author apparently modifies the older expectations.

FIRST FAREWELL DISCOURSE
13:31–14:31

13:31–33 Glorification and Separation. With the traitor out of the way, Jesus can express his deepest sentiments. He declares that now that the Son of man is glorified (cf. 12:23; perhaps understood proleptically because the process leading to the glorification has begun with Judas' departure) and now that God has been glorified through him (i.e., his ministry) God will also glorify him (finally) through himself (i.e., by divine action) and will do so immediately (taking the first step in the imminent crucifixion). Addressing the disciples intimately as "children," Jesus says he is with them for only a short time, and as he had said to the Jews: where he is going, they cannot come to him (7:34, 8:21), so he now says (the same thing) to them (but with the nuance of their not coming "immediately").

13:34–35 The New Commandment. He then gives a new commandment (a significant modification of Lev. 19:18): that they should love one another. Thereby all will know that they are his disciples, if they have love among one another (cf. 15:12; 1 Jn. 3:23). (When Jesus is gone from them, this will be visible proof of their link with him.)

13:36–38 Interruption: Peter's Question Answered. Jesus has spoken of his impending departure. Peter now inquires where Jesus is going. Jesus restates the impossibility of Peter's following him now (v. 33), but indicates that he will do so later. Peter wants to know why he cannot follow now. He is ready to lay down his life for Jesus: Jesus echoes his statement in question form and then with an Amen-saying predicts Peter's denial (three times before cockcrow). The item is drawn from the same tradition found in the Synoptics. (At this point one expects the departure. And indeed it may well be that 14:31c once stood here.)

14:1–4 The Many Mansions. There is no new introductory formula leading to this further discourse material. Jesus exhorts his disciples not to let their hearts be troubled. Let them believe in God (or a question: Do they believe in God?) and (or, then) let them believe in him. In the house of his Father there are many rooms (A.V.: "mansions" echoes Latin *mansiones,* "rooms." Even earthly rulers had palaces with hundreds of rooms; God has one with rooms enough for all followers of Jesus.) If it were not so, would he have said to them that he was going to prepare a place for them? (This was not said before in so many words in the Gospel, but John elsewhere, too, gives supposed quotations, which are really restatements in different words of what Jesus had said; cf. 10:25; 11:40; 12:34. The reference here may be to 12:26. Some think the question is an interpolation.) When he has gone and has prepared a place for them, he will come again and take them to himself (a seeming allusion to the Second Coming; cf. 1 Thess. 4:16 f.), so that they will be where he is. They know the way (to) where he is going.

14:5–7 The Way, the Truth, and the Life. Thomas denies having knowledge of either the objective or the way, and thereby elicits the saying, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." The statement represents a new turn of thought, as was the case also with the bread (Jesus gives bread, 6:27; Jesus is the bread, 6:35). Similarly Jesus pioneers the way to heaven in 14:3, but now figuratively becomes "the way." And he not only imparts the truth, he is the truth (1:17); he not only gives (eternal) life, he is that life (1:4). Thus is put most forcefully the thought that salvation is tied entirely to the person of Christ. Stating it in clearer terms in 6b, he says: "No one comes to the Father, but by me." If they had known him (for what he is), then they would also have known his Father. Henceforth they already know him (i.e., the Father) and have seen him.

14:8–11 Faith in the Unity of Father and Son. Philip (puzzled by this) asks that Jesus show them the Father. Jesus rebukes him: So long a time is he with them and Philip does not know him? Whoever has seen him has seen the Father (revealed in his true nature). How can he say: Show us the Father? Jesus asks Philip whether he does not believe that Jesus is in the Father, and the Father in him. Without awaiting a reply, he declares that the words he speaks to them he does not speak from himself (they have their origin in God; cf. 7:16 f.; 12:49 f.). The Father who abides in him (also) does his (Jesus') works (cf. 5:36). He urges them to believe him that he is in the Father, and the Father in him. But if (they will) not (believe on the testimony of his words), then let them believe on account of the works themselves (cf. 10:37 f.).

14:12–14 Promise for the Disciples. With an eye to their disturbed hearts, Jesus adds assurances. With an Amen-saying, he declares that those who believe in him will be able to do the works (miracles) he does, and even greater than these, because Jesus is going to the Father. What they ask in his name (i.e., with specific invocation of it), he will do (to aid them in their "works") in order that the Father may be glorified in (= through) the Son. (That in other cases it is the Father who answers prayer, 15:16; 16:23, makes no difference.) If this seems to limit such prayers to actions of their ministry as continuation of his own, a blanket assurance that he will answer prayers offered in his name is given in 14:14 (v. 14, however, is missing in some manuscripts and in the Old Syriac version).

14:15–17 First Paraclete Saying. Jesus declares that if they love him they will keep his commandments (cf. 1 Jn. 5:2–3). He then will ask the Father to give them "another helper" or "intercessor" (Gr. *paráklētos;* A.V.: comforter; R.S.V.: counselor). "Another" implies that there is one already, and this is clarified by 1 Jn. 2:1, which speaks of our intercessor (A.V.:

advocate) with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous. The other helper is to be with them always (as substitute for the presence of Jesus). He is the Spirit of truth (i.e., whose very nature is truth, 16:13; 1 Jn. 2:27; the opposite of the spirit of error, 1 Jn. 4:6) without whom the truth cannot be discerned (cf. further v. 26). The unbelieving world cannot receive this Spirit, since it does not see and know him; they, however, know him because he abides with them and will be in them.

The word "paraclete" ordinarily meant in Greek "called to one's aid" (in a court, hence in effect a defense counsel). However, the legal situation does not appear in any of the paraclete passages in the Gospel, and the related noun *paráklēsis* has such meanings as "admonition," "petition," "comfort," "encouragement." The old translation "comforter" is not unwarranted in view of the farewell situation, but the idea of comforting is not stressed in what is said of the paraclete. As will appear, he enlightens the mind of the disciples and lends effectiveness to their preaching. It is apparent that no translation mentioned really conveys this. The term was not coined by the Gospel author. The idea emerges with that of an angel as God's executive aide in the clearance of the high priest accused by Satan (Zech. 3:1 ff.). In the Dead Sea Scroll called *The Rule of the Community* (as also in the *Testament of Judah,* 20) mankind is under the control of two spirits, that of truth and that of error, and the struggle will be resolved eschatologically. The Spirit of Truth, or Prince of Light, as he is also called, is appointed to help (Heb. *'āzar*) the children of light. Out of such background, with perhaps other stimuli, and as substitute for the personal return of Christ as Son of man, has evolved the thought of the paraclete with the special mission of helper of the followers of Jesus.

14:18–21 The Return of Christ. He will not leave them orphaned, but will come to them (in his resurrected state? or allusion to the Second Coming?). Yet a little while (16:16 ff.) and the world will no longer see him. But they will see him (after his resurrection?); because as he lives they also will live (i.e., begin a new existence in a higher sense than physical living?). "On that day" (traditional eschatological term; with use here limited to the Easter situation?) they will know that he is in the Father, but also that they are in Christ and Christ in them. The one who "has" (= late Heb. "in whose hands are") his commandments and keeps them, that person loves him (the thought thus returns to v. 15). He who loves him will be loved by his Father, and Christ will love him, too, and will reveal himself to him (in his resurrection? cf. v. 22).

14:22–24 Interruption: A Disciple's Question Answered. A Judas—not the Iscariotes—speaks up and asks how it has come about that Jesus is going to reveal himself to them but not to the *world.* Jesus replies that if anyone loves him he will keep his words, and his Father will love such a one, and they (both) will come and will make a stay with him. (But this is impossible where his words are not kept.) He who does not love Jesus does not keep his words. The word which they hear is not his but that of him who sent him.

14:25–26 Second Paraclete Saying. He has said these things to them while abiding with them (which stay is about to end). But the helper, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in his name, he will teach them all things (thus supplementing Jesus' teaching) and remind them of all things which he said to them.

14:27–31 Conclusion of the Discourse. Jesus leaves them his peace, his peace he gives to them (in generous measure), not as the world gives (in miserly manner) does he give to them. He bids their heart be untroubled and that they not fear. They have heard that he said to them, "I go and I come (again) to you" (cf. 14:3, 18, 23). If they loved him they would rejoice that he is going to the Father, because the Father is greater than he. As in 13:19 he tells it to them before it happens, so that when it happens they may believe. No longer will he speak many things with them, for the ruler of the world (the Devil, 12:31) is coming. He has nothing (i.e., no portion) in him (i.e., the Devil controls no part of Jesus' inner life); but that the world may know that he loves the Father and that as the Father commanded him, so he does (therefore has the Devil been given power to afflict him, cf. Job 2:6). Having ended the discourse, Jesus says: "Arise, let us go away from here" (i.e., the place of banqueting).

SECOND FAREWELL DISCOURSE
15:1–16:33

After 14:31c the departure for the Mount of Olives (18:1) is in order. But instead of this expected continuation, another farewell discourse, without any introductory formula, and a final prayer of Jesus (ch. 17) follow. Some scholars think ch. 14 originally followed chs. 15–16. But it seems equally possible that we see here how the Gospel grew under its author's hands. He could not very well put the remark of 14:31c after 17:26, so he left it at the point at which he had placed it, after developing ch. 14. (It may already have been moved from an earlier position—after 13:38.)

15:1–8 The True Vine. The opening "figure," or parable, lends this discourse a peculiar fitness for the situation. For while John does not tell of the Lord's Supper and did not regard it as instituted by Jesus, he here shows knowledge of it as an ecclesiastical rite.

Jesus calls himself the true vine (in the sense of exclusiveness—the only source of the life that is about to be described; cf. 1:9, "the true light"). His heavenly Father is the husbandman. That the disciples are the branches growing from the vine is implied by what follows. Every branch on him (= the vine) not bearing fruit he (God) removes (with the knife), and every one bearing fruit he "cleanses" (i.e., prunes) that it will bear more. They are already "clean" (pruned) through the word (= the instruction or exhortation, note pl. in v. 7) which he has spoken to them. Let them remain in him, and he (will remain) in them. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it remain in the vine, so they cannot (bear fruit) except they remain in him. He repeats: *He* is the vine and they the branches. The one who remains in this interdependent connection will bring much fruit, because without him they can do nothing. If anyone does not remain in him, he will be cast out (of the vineyard) like the (cut-off) branch and will wither; and they (impersonal) gather them (i.e., such branches) and throw (them) into the fire and they are burned (Mt. 13:40). If they remain in him and his words remain in them, whatever they wish they may ask and it will be given them. In this his Father is glorified (13: 31), that they bring much fruit and that they will become disciples to him (13:35, in the full sense of the word).

15:9–17 Abiding in Christ's Love. As the Father loves him, so he loves them. Let them remain in his love. (This they will do) if they keep his commandments, as he kept the commandments of his Father and (so) remains in *his* love. This is his (chief) commandment: that they love one another, as he loved them (cf. 13:34). And he then gives a saying—probably a secular quotation—using the word "love" in the ordinary rather than in his usual deeper sense: "Greater love hath no man than this: that a man lay down his life for his friends." The quotation suggested calling the disciples his "friends." (The king's "friends" almost had cabinet status in the Hellenistic world, and the Messianic king, too, could readily be imagined as having such a group around him.) They are, indeed, his friends if they do what he commands them (cf. 14:15). He does not call them slaves because a slave does not know what his master does (i.e., the reasons behind his commands). He calls them friends because he has made known to them all things which he has heard from the Father. They did not elect him; he elected them (6:70) and appointed them (as Apostles; cf. Acts 20: 28) that they should go (Lk. 10:3) and bear fruit (through success in their ministry), and that their fruit (thus achieved) should abide, in order that what they ask the Father in his name he may give them (cf. 14:12, 13, 15:7, 8). He has commanded these things to them that they may love one another.

15:18–25 The Hatred of the World. The discourse now dwells on the new theme of the hatred that the world will entertain for the disciples (cf. Mt. 5:11; 10:16 f.). If the world hates them let them know that it hated him prior to them. If they were of the world, the world would love that which is its own. Because they are not of the world (any longer), but chosen out of it by him, therefore it hates them. Let them remember the word he said to them that the slave is not greater than his master (13:16a, cf. Mt. 10:24). If they persecuted him they will persecute them also; if they kept his word, they will also keep theirs. (Have two negative particles dropped out in the last sentence?) But all these things they will do to them on account of his name (i.e., their confession of it), because they (the people of the world) do not know the one who sent him. If Jesus had not come and spoken to them, they would have no sin (on this score). But now they have no excuse with respect to their sin (of unbelief). He who hates him hates the Father. Had he not done the works (i.e., miracles) among them which no one else has (ever) done, they would have no sin. But now they have seen them, and (yet) have hated—both him and his Father. But (this has happened) in order that the word which is written in their Law (= Scripture) might be fulfilled: "They hated him without reason" (Ps. 35:19; 69:5; construed as Messianic prophecy).

15:26–27 Third Paraclete Saying. When the helper comes whom he will send to them from the Father, the Spirit of truth who goes forth from the Father, he will bear (true) witness about Jesus, and they also will bear witness because they were with him from the beginning.

16:1–4 Continuation of 15:18–25. He has spoken these things to them lest they take offense (in their faith). They (i.e., the Jews) will make them "synagogue-less" (9:22; 12:42). But (= yea more) the hour will come when anyone who kills them will think he is bringing worship to God. (No doubt this is a reflection of real happenings of the Apostolic Age, such as the killing of James the son of Zebedee; Acts 12:1.) These things they will do because they know neither the Father nor him. He has said these things to them that they may recall them (15:20) when their hour comes. He did not say these things to them from the beginning because he was with them (and bearing the hatred of the world alone).

16:5–11 Fourth Paraclete Saying. But now Jesus is going to him that sent him, and none of them asks him where he is going. But because he has said these things to them, sorrow has filled their hearts. He tells them the truth: It is beneficial for them that he is going away, for if he did not go, "the helper" would not come to them. When he has gone, he will send the helper to them. When he (the helper) comes, he will convince (8:46) the world concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment. (1) Concerning sin: that they do not believe in Christ (i.e., the world's unbelief is sin). (2) Concerning righteousness: that Christ is going to the Father and they no longer see him (i.e., his departure to heaven is proof of Christ's victorious righteousness). (3) Concerning judgment: that the prince of this world (the Devil) is judged (and condemned when Jesus is glorified; cf. 12:31). (Proofs of 2 and 3 are needed to persuade the world of 1.)

16:12–15 Fifth Paraclete Saying. But the helper also has an office to perform with respect to the disciples. There are yet many things (divine secrets) Jesus has to say to them, but they are not able now to endure them. However, when he comes—the Spirit of truth (14:17; 15:26)—he will lead them into all truth. For he will not speak "from himself," but (only) what he hears (from the Father, 15:26) will he say and the coming things he will announce to them. He will glorify Jesus by taking from that which is his (i.e., his store of knowledge) and proclaiming it to them. Whatever things the Father has are Jesus'. For this reason Jesus has just said that he (the helper) will take from that which is Jesus' and proclaim (it) to them.

16:16–24 Two Brief Intervals. In a little while (Gr. *mikrón*) they will no longer see him. But again in a little while they will see him (i.e., after his resurrection).

There is a seeming pause in the discourse, while the disciples express to each other perplexity over this statement, which they repeat (the author's way of hammering it in) and to which they add his earlier remark about going to the Father (16:10). What (above all) does he mean by "a little while"? They do not understand what he is saying.

Jesus, aware that they were going to ask him about this, now continues. (The author has thus not been describing a real interruption, but only a mental process on the part of the disciples.) He tells them that they are inquiring among themselves concerning his saying of v. 16 (repeated once more for emphasis). With an Amen-saying he declares that (after his death) they will weep and lament (as customary at funerals), but that the world will rejoice. They will be sorrowful, but their sorrow will be turned into joy (at his resurrection?). He compares their situation to that of a woman in travail. When she gives birth she has sorrow because her hour has come, but when the child is born she forgets the tribulation because of the joy that a human being has been born into the world. They (too) now have sorrow, but he will see them again and their heart will rejoice and no one can take their joy from them. "On that day" (traditional eschatological term as in 14:20) they will not (need to) ask anything (i.e., any questions) of Jesus. With an Amen-saying he declares that whatever they ask the Father, he will give them in Jesus' name. (Not only is the asking done in Jesus' name, the Father's giving too is done in it.) Hitherto they have not prayed in Jesus' name. Let them ask and they will receive, that their joy may be made full.

16:25–28 Concluding Prophecy. He has spoken these things (cf. chs. 15–16) in figures (10:6, which naturally cannot convey the full reality). The hour will come when he will freely tell them about the Father. "On that day" they will ask in his name, and he is not saying that he (then) will ask the Father concerning them (i.e., support their petitions—new over against vv. 23 f.; 15:7, 16); for the Father himself loves them because they love Jesus and believe him to have gone forth from the Father. He declares that he has gone forth from the Father and come into the world, and is (now) leaving the world and returning to the Father.

16:29–33 Final Colloquy with the Disciples. The disciples declare that now he has spoken freely and not in a "figure," and express a confession of faith. They know now that he knows all things and has no need that anyone should ask him (being able to anticipate their questions, as shown in vv. 19 f.); therefore they believe that he has gone forth from God (his return to God was not yet in this situation an object of faith). Jesus answered: Do they believe now (at the present moment)? The hour is coming and has (already) come when they will scatter, each one to his own (things) and leave him alone. (This agrees with the older tradition, Mk. 14:27, 50; Mt. 26:31, 56; but not with the portrayal in Lk. 22:54; 24:33 and Jn. 18:12; 20:19). But Jesus (though he will be forsaken of friends) is not alone, for the Father is with him (8:29). He has spoken these things that they may have peace in him (or through him). In the world they have tribulation (cf. 16:21), but let them take courage: he has (proleptically speaking) conquered the world (by conquering the prince of this world), and with him they too will conquer it (cf. 12:31; Rev. 3:21; 1 Jn. 5:4–5).

The High Priestly Prayer

17:1–26

John makes no mention of the psalm recitation of Mk. 14:26 and is going to cancel the prayer in Gethsemane. Instead he introduces a prayer here (an afterthought, as was already the case with the second farewell discourse; cf. 14:31c). It exhibits Christ speaking to God about his mission on earth, his return to heaven, and the followers whom he leaves behind, and thus is of climactic significance. Since the sixteenth century, scholars have called it the high priestly prayer (because of v. 19). It has apparently been expanded, as there is considerable repetition.

17:1–5 Petition for "Glorification." The transition is made very simply: "These things Jesus spoke, and lifting up his eyes to heaven (cf. 11:41) he said." Standing prayer is presupposed. Addressing God as Father, he says that the hour (of the Passion) has come (cf. 12:23). May he glorify his Son (by receiving him into heaven) in order that the Son may glorify him (cf. 13:31)—just as (i.e., such glorification of Christ corresponds to the fact that) he has given him power (1:12) over all flesh (= all men) in order that (to) all which (neuter as in 6:37, 39) God has given him, he (Jesus) may give eternal life. The latter consists in knowing God as the only true God and him whom he has sent, Jesus Christ. (The author here loses sight of the fact that Jesus himself is supposedly praying.) He has (to the extent possible) glorified God on earth, completing the work which God gave him to do. May the Father now glorify him (by association) with him, with the glory which he had with him before the world existed.

17:6–8 Retrospect. Jesus has revealed God's name (i.e., true nature; cf. 12:28) to the men whom God gave to him out of (the great mass in) the world. They were God's and he gave them to Jesus, and they have kept God's Word. They now know that all things—whatever God has given him—are from God, because the words which God gave to him, he has given to them. And they have received them and know truly that he went forth from God, and they have believed that God sent him. (This is the whole sum and substance of the revelation he brought.)

17:9–19 Prayer of Intercession for the Disciples. He prays for them—not for the world (which is under God's judgment), but for those whom God has given him—because they are (still) God's (inasmuch as) all that he has is God's and all that God has is his (cf. 16:15), and because Jesus is glorified in them (through their faith in his revelation). Jesus is (virtually) no longer in the world, and (= but) they are in it, while he is coming to God. Addressing God as "Holy Father," he prays that he may keep them "in his name" (i.e., in the true knowledge of him) which God has given him, in order that they may be one, just as God and he are one. While he was with them, he kept them in God's name, which God had given him, and guarded them (12:25), and none of them was lost except the "son of perdition" (Judas, who had to be lost) in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled (cf. 13:18; Ps. 41:10). But now Jesus is going to God, and these things he speaks while still in the world that they may have his own joy completed in themselves. He has given them God's Word, and the world hated them (for it; here the author again loses sight of the situation and is thinking of the hatred subsequently experienced by the Apostles), because they are not of the world, just as he is not of the world. He is not praying that God should take them out of the world (where their function is to continue his work), but rather that he should keep them from the Evil One (i.e., the Devil; cf. 1 Jn. 2:18 f.; 3:12; 5:18, 19). They are not out of the world, just as he is not out of the world. He prays that God may hallow them (for their ministry, 10:36) in truth (i.e., the true knowledge of God); his word is the truth. (Thus hallowed they are equipped for their task.) As the Father sent him into the world, so he sends them into it. He is now hallowing himself (as sacrifice; cf. 1:29; Ex. 13:2; Deut. 15:19; according to some as priest, Ex. 28:41 and then leading to comparison with Heb. 9:11 ff.) "for them" (allusion to Lord's Supper) that they themselves (also) may become hallowed in truth (cf. v. 17).

17:20–23 Petition for the Converts of the Disciples. Not for the disciples alone does he pray, but for those believing in him through their word (i.e., teaching) that all may be one as he, the Father, is in Christ, and Christ in him, in order that they (i.e., God and Christ) also may be in them, for the purpose that the world may believe that God has sent him. Jesus has given them the glory God gave him (as manifested in his miracles 1:14, 2:11, which they will be able to duplicate, 14:12) to the end that they may be one, as God and he are one. He is in them and the Father is in him that they may be completed into one, that the world may know that God sent him and that he (God) loves them as he loves Jesus.

17:24–26 Petition for Reunion with the Disciples. With a new invocation ("Father") he asks that what (=those) God has given him may be with him where he is (= will be), to behold his glory which God has given him, because he loved him before founding of the world. He appeals to him as "righteous" Father; he reminds him that the world did not know him, but that he, Christ, knew him, and that these (disciples) have recognized that God has sent him (and hence God's righteousness may well be employed in their vindication and in judging the world). He has made God's name known to them and will (continue to) make it known (on a higher level, 16:25), in order that the love with which God loved him may be in them also, and that he (Jesus) may (likewise) be in them.

Thus his final thought and prayer is concerned with the fellowship of love: God, the Son, the believers—in blessed union. Therewith the Testament of Christ that began with the Washing of Feet in ch. 13 reaches its consummation. There is no mention in this prayer of the paraclete or of the return of Christ. Therein it differs from ch. 16. It stands closer in thought to ch. 15, but has a more universal outlook. The Father is drawn more closely into the relationship of Christ and his followers.

B. THE PASSION NARRATIVE
18:1–19:42

18:1–11 The Betrayal (Mk. 14:26; Mt. 26:30–56; Lk. 22:39–53). Only at a few points has this Gospel made contact with the main line of tradition as represented by the Synoptics. But for the Passion and post-resurrection narratives it is forced to follow the main stream, even though making additions, omissions, and alterations. This shows how established that tradition was.

vv. 1–3 After the prayer, Jesus departed with his disciples and crossed the brook Cedron (Gr. *Kedron;* Heb. Kidron: 2 Sam. 15:23, etc.) and went to a place where there was a garden, which he and his disciples entered. This replaces Mark's "locality named Gethsemane," and the impression is given that the place lay immediately east of the brook. As there is no warrant for mention of a garden, according to the older tradition, it seems probable that by the time the Fourth Gospel was written, a garden had been developed at the supposed site, as also at the tomb (cf. on 20:15). Pious sentiment on the part of a new, more Hellenistically influenced population, was finding a satisfaction in visiting and embellishing places where significant events in the life of Christ had occurred. The evangelist notes that Judas "who betrayed him" (cf. 13:11) knew the place too, for Jesus often gathered there with his disciples (an item not mentioned by the Synoptics and perhaps reflecting Christian gatherings at the garden in Passion week). This evangelist has canceled the agony of Christ and the special role of Peter, James, and John. He represents Jesus as the master of his own fate. The only echo of a distress on the part of Jesus was given in advance in 12:27. Judas takes the (Roman) "cohort" and servants (not "officers") of the high priests and Pharisees. He comes there with torches and lamps and weapons.

vv. 4–11 Jesus, knowing all "the coming things," went forth (from the garden) to him (i.e., Judas) and asked them whom they were seeking. They replied: "Jesus the Nazoraean" (cf. on Mt. 2:23). He declared, "I am Jesus." Judas, the one betraying him, stood there with them. When Jesus had said, "I am (he)," they departed rearward and fell to the ground (miraculously overwhelmed). A second time Jesus repeated the same question, and on receiving the same answer declares that he had (already) said to them, "I am (he)," and that if they were seeking him, they should let the disciples go. The evangelist explains that this was in order that the word which he had spoken, about not losing any one of those whom God had given him (17:12), might be fulfilled. (In this way the author relieves the disciples of the charge of ignominious flight.)

As though to show that they were no cowards, the evangelist makes Simon Peter the possessor of the sword, which he draws and with which he smites the servant of the high priest, cutting off his ear. Not only can he give the name of Mark's unidentified swordsman, he can also name his victim—a man named Malchus. But unlike Luke, he does not describe the miraculous healing of the man. Jesus merely tells Peter to put the sword into the sheath, saying, should he not drink the cup which the Father has given him? Thus the older Gethsemane prayer of Mk. 14:36 is metamorphosed into an utterance of calm resolution and Jesus is portrayed as an entirely voluntary prisoner! We have a valuable illustration here of how ideology remodels a tradition and produces something with a totally different effect.

18:12–27 The Hearing before Annas; Peter's Denial (Mk. 14:53–72; Mt. 26:57–75; Lk. 22:54–71)

vv. 12–14 In the arresting of Jesus, Roman rather than Jewish initiative is stressed; the cohort and its chief (the *chiliarch* or commander of a thousand; cf. Acts 21:31 f.; but both terms are probably used loosely) took Jesus and bound him. (Contrast the fact that in Mk. Jesus is not bound until later; Mk. 15:1.) How it was possible to obtain Roman aid for the arrest of Jesus, and why Jesus was then not taken directly to Roman headquarters for questioning, is not explained. Instead, he is first taken to "Annas the father of Caiaphas, who was the high priest of the year." The latter's declaration before the Synedrium (11:39) is then quoted. The hearing before Annas thus seems superfluous. (It may well be that the evangelist is using a version of the Passion story in which Annas was described as the high priest who judged Jesus, and that he reconciled it with other versions mentioning Caiaphas by having Jesus appear first before Annas, who then sent him to Caiaphas. On the history see on p. 205.)

vv. 15–18. Peter's "following" had become part of the traditional story. But this author takes away some of his credit for such boldness; he would not have been in the court of the high priest at all had it not been for "another disciple," who was known to the high priest (and hence to the latter's doorkeeper), and who went along into the hall while Peter stood outside. Then this other disciple (apparently identical with the one of 13:23; 20:2 f., who is called "the other disciple" in 20:4, 8) went out (again) and spoke to the doorkeeper, and led Peter in. The doorkeeper-girl asked Peter whether he were not one of the disciples of that man (Jesus). He answered that he was not. (The mysterious disciple is suddenly lost sight of and does not appear again until 19:26; he has obviously been injected into this particular story artificially.) The slaves and the servants (of v. 3) stood there, having made a coal fire, for it was cold, and were warming themselves. And Peter was standing with them, also warming himself.

vv. 19–24 The hearing before Annas is very different from the Synoptic version of his arraignment before the high priest (Caiaphas). No Synedrium is convoked; there is no trial, perhaps because the death of Jesus has already been voted in 11:47 f. Annas merely asks Jesus about his disciples and his teaching. Jesus declares that he has spoken freely "to the world" and has constantly taught in synagogues and in the Temple, where "all Jews" come together, and has spoken nothing in secret. Why ask him? Let him ask those who heard what he said to them. They know what he said.

One of the servants who was standing there struck Jesus' cheek, asking whether one answered the high priest in this manner. Jesus replied that if he spoke evilly, let him bear witness concerning the evil (i.e., specify what was evil about it). But if (he spoke) well (= truly), why does the servant strike him? Therewith the hearing before Annas peters out. We hear nothing of accusations or of a verdict (cf. Mk. 14:55–64). The author had little interest in that angle, for to him Jesus is going to death of his own free will; his crucifixion is part of the process of his "glorification."

To affect harmonization with the Caiaphas tradition, the evangelist has Annas send Jesus bound to Caiaphas. That this is artificial and that the tradition here used thought of Annas as the official high priest is patent from the fact that after the removal of Jesus, the lingering of Peter in the hall of Annas becomes pointless.

vv. 25–27 The author now finishes the story of Peter, which, following the earlier tradition, is wrapped around the trial scene. He was still standing warming himself (v. 18). "They" (the bystanders) asked him whether he was not also one of Jesus' disciples. Peter denied it. One of the servants of the high priest (18:3; the handmaiden of Mk. 14:69 is thus replaced), a relative of the one whose ear Peter had cut off, asked whether he had not seen him with Jesus in the garden? (Peter's peril was thus greatly increased; after the surrender of 18:8, he would have been fairly safe had it not been for his needless act of 18:10.) (For the third time) Peter denied, and immediately the cock crowed (13:38). The single cock-crow is presupposed here, as in Mt., Lk. (in Mk., the cock crows twice). There is no allusion to the prophecy of 13:38, and nothing is said about Peter's remorse or departure. The story therefore is not nearly as effective as the Synoptic account.

18:28–19:16 The Trial Before Pilate (Mk. 15:1–19; Mt. 27:11–30; Lk. 23:1–25)

18:28–32 The Jews Insist on Roman Judgment. They led Jesus from Caiaphas to the praetorium (see on Mk. 15:16) "very early." (This is mentioned to allow time for the events of the day.) If the evangelist has downgraded the Jewish trial, he has perhaps done so to throw the spotlight on the trial before Pilate, to which he devotes considerable space. He notes that the Jews would not enter (the heathen domicile) for fear of defilement, because they wanted to eat the Passover meal. (This, therefore, was still before them, not behind them, as in the Synoptics.) In view of their ritualistic scruples, Pilate went forth to them and inquired what charge they were bringing against this man? They replied in testy manner that if this one were not an evildoer they would not have handed him over (to him). They thus expect action on their mere recommendation, without examination of the case. Pilate (declining to render judgment without a proper charge) told them to take Jesus and judge him according to their law. They rejected this on the ground that they could not impose a legal death penalty—thus revealing what they really wanted. (They were not satisfied with an irregular "religious" killing by stoning—for blasphemy—which was within their power, 10:33, but wanted action by Roman authority and thus relief from responsibility for the blood of Jesus; contrast Mt. 27:17, 25.) The author here notes that the word of Jesus which he spoke, indicating by what death he was going to die (12:32), was thus to be fulfilled (in his being hung on a cross).

18:33–38 First Hearing before Pilate. Rather strangely, Pilate interviews the Jews and Jesus separately, the former outdoors, the latter indoors. He now re-enters the praetorium to question the prisoner. He asks him whether he is the king of the Jews. This seems to presuppose that he was accused of such pretension (his acceptance of the title, king of *Israel;* cf. 12:13). One may imagine that such an accusation had already been made to secure military co-operation in the arrest of Jesus (18:3). The latter parries by asking whether Pilate said this of his own accord or whether others had said it to him about him? (The author is bound by received material here, for the Jesus whom he has hitherto described would not have needed to be told!) Pilate asks: Is he a Jew? Jesus' own people and the high priests have handed Jesus over to him (with implied if not formulated charges). What has he done? Jesus declares that his kingdom is not of this world. If it were of this world, his servants (!) would have fought that he should not be handed over to the Jews. But now his kingdom is not thence (i.e., of the world). This elicits the question of Pilate, "So then thou art a king?" Jesus replies, "Thou sayest that I am a king." (This recalls the "thou sayest" or "hast said (it)" of Mt. 26:25, 64, etc., and implies the assent, "So it is.") But he adds comments indicating that this involves no trespass of sedition: for this was he born (1:13) and came into the world (1:9), that he might bear witness to the truth (cf. 3:32, i.e., the higher knowledge of God that has come to earth in and through Jesus). The one who is "of the truth" (i.e., belongs to its sphere) hears his voice (cf. 8:47, 10:27). Pilate asks: "What is truth?" His question shows lack of comprehension; he is not "of the truth," and his turning away shows that he does not want to hear the voice of Jesus any further. (If the saying of Jesus in v. 36 and the question of Pilate are cleverly exploited, as, e.g., in

Spengler's *Decline of the West,* where the world of politics and that of religion are seen as contrasted, this goes far beyond the real meaning of the author.)

18:39–40 Pilate's Offer to the Jews. Pilate then goes out again to the Jews and declares he can find no guilt on the part of Jesus (and hence is unwilling to sentence him). He sees a way out of the embarrassing situation for both himself and the Jews. They (the Romans) customarily release someone to them on the Passover. Do they wish to release to them "the king of the Jews"? (His irony suggests he is speaking from a position of strength. But he has not reckoned with the determination of his opponents.) They cry out again (allusion to v. 31b?), "Not this one, but Barabbas." The author notes that Barabbas was a robber (cf. Mk. 15:7 f.).

19:1–7 The Scourging and Mocking of Jesus. (Re-entering the praetorium) Pilate directs that Jesus be scourged (with the intent of inflicting a punishment that will give the Jews some satisfaction and lead them to accept his offer). This scourging is not described in the older sources, but a proposal of it is expressed in Lk. 23:16, 22. With it the author has combined the mocking of Jesus by the Roman soldiery (Mk. 15:16–20; Mt. 27:27–31). The soldiers plaited a crown of thorns and put it on his head, threw about him a purple robe, and came to him, saying: "Greetings, O king of the Jews," and slapped his face.

Pilate then went out and announced to the Jews that he was going to lead Jesus to them in order that they might know that he found no guilt in him. (The purpose of this statement is not clear. Was the idea of the mummery to make Jesus ridiculous?) Then Jesus came forth wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. Pilate said to them, "Behold (= here is) the man" (in the Vulgate: *ecce homo*). When the high priests and the servants saw him, they cried, "Crucify, crucify (him)!" Pilate then told them that they should take Jesus and crucify him (this evidently is not meant seriously, nor is it taken seriously) because he (for his part) found no guilt in Jesus. They replied that they had a law, and that according to the law he ought to die (Lev. 24:16) because he made himself Son of God (5:18, 10:33). Just why they are not law-abiding enough to carry out the command of *stoning* the blasphemer is not clear; the historical fact is, of course, that Jesus was crucified by order of Pilate. To put the blame on the Jews, it had to be shown how the decision was forced on him.

19:8–12 The Second Hearing. When Pilate heard this, he became more afraid (i.e., because of the mention of a possible supernatural origin of Jesus). Re-entering the praetorium (no mention is made of Jesus' having been taken back there), he asks Jesus, "Whence art thou?" (i.e., has Jesus come from heaven?). Jesus gives him no answer (cf. Mk. 15:5). The Roman asks: He does not answer *him?* Does he not know that he has power to release or to crucify him? Jesus now replies that Pilate would have no power over him if it were not given him from above. (Christians were recognizing existing political authority as divinely ordained; cf. Rom. 13:1.) Therefore (since he is asked to judge in a case he hardly understands), the one who handed Jesus over to him has greater sin. (According to 18:24, 28, this could mean Caiaphas. It is, however, possible to translate collectively "those who," instead of "the one who," in which case "the greater sin" would mean that of the Jews or of their leaders; cf. 18:30.)

Upon this (saying of Jesus), Pilate sought to release Jesus (by letting him go forth in secret?). But the Jews (discerning his plan?) now played their trump card. They cried out that if he released Jesus, he was no "friend" of Caesar. Everyone who makes himself king opposes Caesar. The threat of complaint against him no doubt disturbed Pilate. (There is a faint echo here of the fact that Pilate was actually removed as a result of complaints a few years later; cf. Jos., *Ant., 18,* 4, 1.)

19:13–16 The Sentencing of Jesus. Hearing these words, Pilate led Jesus out and seated himself (on the judgment seat) at a place called "the pavement" (Gr. *lithóstrōton*). The author adds that it was called Gabbatha (probably *gabbetā,* "elevation") in "Hebrew" (i.e., Aramaic). (No such place, however, is mentioned in the Talmud or in Josephus. The name may have been given to the spot in the Jerusalem church after A.D. 70, as men attempted to identify sites of sacred history.)

At this point John notes that it was the day of preparation (technical term for the day before the Sabbath; cf. Mk. 15:42)—in this case for a Passover falling on a Sabbath, and that it was the sixth hour (= noon) when Pilate took the judgment seat. (In the Synoptic tradition, Jesus is crucified at the third hour, 9:00 A.M.; Mk. 15:25.) The Roman permits himself a bit of sarcastic play with the Jews, saying to them: "Behold your king!" (cf. v. 5 "behold the man"). They cry out: "Take (him) away, take (him) away, crucify him!" Pilate then asks: "Shall I crucify your king?" They declare that they have no king but Caesar. (Their later rebellion against Caesar was thus all the more wicked and deserving of punishment.) He thereupon handed Jesus over to them that he should be crucified. (Roman soldiers were now evidently instructed to carry out the wishes of the Jewish leaders, as at the arrest.) The attempt to relieve Pilate of blame is patent in this presentation of the happenings.

The scourging which regularly preceded crucifixion could be omitted, as it had already been done in 19:1.

19:17–37 The Crucifixion of Jesus (Mk. 15:21–37; Mt. 27:31–50; Lk. 23:26–46)

vv. 17–22 Then they took Jesus away, and bearing the cross himself (the Johannine Jesus needs no help; contrast Mk. 15:21), he went out to the place called "the one of the skull," which in "Hebrew" (Aramaic) is called Golgotha (cf. on Mk. 15:22), where they crucified him, and with him two others, "from here and from here" (i.e., on either side), Jesus the middle one. Pilate also wrote a "title" (Gr. *títlos,* from Lat. *titulus,* a board on which was inscribed the cause of the execution (this evangelist thus uses the proper technical term), and placed it on the cross. (It was usually borne ahead of the condemned person; no doubt one must not take the words too literally as though Pilate went out to Golgotha.) It was written: "Jesus the Nazoraean (cf. on Mt. 2:23), the king of the Jews" (The inscription in Mk.: "The king of the Jews"). Then many of the Jews read this title, because the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city. (The inscription was humiliating for the Jews.) The high priests said to Pilate that he should not write "the king of the Jews," but "he said he was the king of the Jews." (The narrative lacks clarity here, thereby betraying that this is a newly developed item; cf. Mk. 15:26.) Pilate replied that what he had written, he had written.

vv. 23–24 When the soldiers had crucified Jesus they took his garments (pl. for sing.; his outer garment or robe is meant) and made four parts (of it), one for each (of the four soldiers attending to the crucifixion), and the tunic (Gr. *chitōn*). The latter was seamless, being woven from (the parts) above (i.e., the neck) through the whole. (The garments of the priests of Ex. 28:3 f. were of one piece according to rabbinic tradition, and according to Josephus, likewise the *chiton* of the high priest, Ex. 28:32; Jos., *Ant., 3,* 7, 4. Perhaps knowledge of this influenced the author at this point.) This evangelist restricts the gambling for the garments (Mk. 15:24) to the tunic, following Ps. 22:19, which Mark had in mind, but had not exploited literally enough. The fulfillment of prophecy is driven home with the remark: Then the soldiers did these things.

vv. 25–27 The older tradition had spoken of some women looking on from afar, mentioning three by name (Mk. 15:40; Mt. 27:55). According to this Gospel, the three were Jesus' mother; and the sister of his mother, Mary (daughter?) of Clopas (the Cleopas of Lk. 24:18?); and Mary Magdalene. Seeing his mother and standing there (also) the disciple whom he loved (13:23, lost sight of since 18:15), Jesus said to his mother, "Woman (2:4), behold thy son," and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother." (By augmenting the Passion tradition with this episode, the author introduced a much appreciated sentimental element.) From "that hour" the disciple took her into his own (home, 16:32).

As Mary had other sons who later are with her at Jerusalem (Acts 1:14), this is perplexing. Shall one interpret historically and hold that Mary outlived her sons and then entered the home of this disciple? Some have inferred from v. 27b that the disciple lived at Jerusalem, and have identified him with John Mark, of whom this was true, Acts 12:12. Others consider him only a fictional figure and proceed to allegorize this in one way or another, e.g., the disciple, representing Gentile Christianity, is hereby urged to take a loving interest in his "mother," Jewish-Christianity. It seems strange that the veil has been so completely drawn over the fate of the mother and brothers of Jesus.

vv. 28–30 After this, Jesus, knowing that already all things were completed that the Scripture might be wholly fulfilled, said that he was thirsty. There was a vessel of vinegar lying there. Then they (Mk.: one individual) put a sponge full of vinegar on a hyssop-stalk (Mk.: a reed) and brought it to his mouth. When he had taken the vinegar, Jesus said, "It is completed," and inclining the head he "gave over" the spirit (to God voluntarily, cf. 10:18). The end is thus made triumphant—more satisfying to the reader than Mk. 15:37 (on which Luke, too, had improved).

vv. 31–37 Since it was the day of preparation (for the Sabbath; cf. Mk. 15:42), in order that the bodies might not remain on the cross on the Sabbath, for that Sabbath day was great (coinciding as it did in that year with the Passover), the Jews asked Pilate that their bones be broken and they be taken (down from the cross; cf. Deut. 21:23). Then the soldiers came and (with clubs) broke the bones of the first robber and the one crucified with him. (This was known to the Romans as *crucifragium* and was done to hasten the death of the unfortunates.) When they came to Jesus and saw that he had already died they did not break his bones, but one of the soldiers pierced his side with his spear and immediately blood and water issued forth. (This miraculous occurrence is given particular emphasis.) The one who saw this (the beloved disciple?) has borne witness (cf. 1:34) and his witness is dependable; he knows that he speaks what is true, in order that the readers too may believe. For this came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled (Ps. 34:21), and also another Scripture passage (Zech. 12:10).

The Scripture passages quoted make no reference to the blood and water, but it is this item which the solemn reference to the witness is intended to reinforce. It seems probable that vv. 34b–35 are an addition of the same editorial hand that provided 21:24. The author himself had not in this editor's opinion sufficiently emphasized the blood-and-water item. He thus calls attention to it without elucidating it. The blood and water are apparently symbolic of the Lord's Supper (6:53–56) and Baptism (cf. 3:5). Mention of the blood before the water is natural here, since the death of Jesus is being described; otherwise, water is mentioned before blood (1 Jn. 5:6–8).

The taking down (and burial) of the bodies by the soldiers is not related. This, however, was the objective with which 19:31 f. started off. The older tradition had dwelt on the same idea of burial before nightfall, but restricted its interest to the body of Jesus. The author now follows this tradition with modifications of his own.

19:38–42 The Burial of Jesus (Mk. 15:42–47; Mt. 27:57–61; Lk. 23:50–56). "After these days" Joseph of Arimathea—a disciple of Jesus, but secretly out of fear of the Jews—asked and received permission from Pilate to take down the body of Jesus, which he then did. Nicodemus, who the first time had come to Jesus by night (3:1), also came, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes (Song of Sol. 4:14) of about a hundred pounds. (The immense quantity indicates his desire to honor Jesus.) They then took the body of Jesus and bound (i.e., wrapped) it with the spices in linen bands. There was at the place where he was crucified a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre in which no one had ever been laid. There, on account of the day of preparation of the Jews and because the sepulchre was near, they placed Jesus. (The earlier sources know nothing of a garden. It seems probable that here, as at the place across the Kidron, 18:1, Christian devotion had created a garden spot in the period of the re-established church after A.D. 70.) The apocryphal Gospel of Peter speaks of "Joseph's garden" to make clear that the tomb was Joseph's. But the words of the evangelist indicate that he thought Jesus was put into this tomb only because of its proximity. That would seem to imply the intention to remove the body once the Sabbath was over. The women spectators of the burial (Mk. 15: 40–41) have dropped out. By introducing Nicodemus, the author obtained another male witness, and so did not need them. Thereby, however, he loses the sure identification of the site of the tomb required for 20:1.

The Post-Resurrection Narrative
20:1–20:31

20:1–2 The Empty Tomb. John here is following a faded version of the Synoptic story. Having dropped the role of the women at and after the burial (cf. Mk. 15:47; 16:1), he does not need three women or even two (Mt. 28:1) on Easter morning; and so Mary Magdalene, the first mentioned in the older stories, has alone retained a role in this narrative. And that in spite of the fact that she has not been referred to in this Gospel.

On the first of the Sabbaths (= days of the week), early, while it was still dark (contrast Mk. 16:2, where the sun was rising), Mary comes to the tomb. She finds the stone (to which no reference was made in 19:42) taken away. Intentionally nothing is said of her entering the tomb or even looking into it (but cf. v. 11). She immediately runs to Peter and the beloved disciple (were the others not with them?), and reports, "They have taken the Lord from the tomb and *we* (echo of the fact that there were more women? or pl. for sing.?) do not know where they put him." Mary's story is subsequently continued in vv. 11–18.

20:3–10 The Two Leading Disciples Hasten to the Tomb. Peter and the beloved disciple now run out to the tomb. The latter arrives first, and peering into the tomb sees the linen bands lying there. (He was thus the very first to see them, Mary not having done so.) The narrative notes especially that he did not enter. This privilege is reserved for Peter, the first of the Apostles, who goes in and sees not only the linen bands but also the "napkin" or towel (cf. Jn. 11:44) that had been wrapped about the head and which lay folded in a separate place. (The Church Fathers regarded this item as proof that the body had not been stolen.) Then the other disciple enters, sees it, and believes (that Jesus is risen from the dead). Both should have known it from prophecy, but they did not yet understand the Scripture (which proved) that it was necessary for him to rise from the dead. (Some hold that Peter "believed," too, but that seems doubtful since this author is trying to show the beloved disciple's superiority in insight.) The disciples then depart again "to themselves" (i.e., their lodgings). While their visit to the tomb was uneventful, it was useful from an apologetic point of view. It provided more reliable witness for the empty tomb than that of a woman or even of the two or three women of the Synoptics, and controverted Jewish claims that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus (Mt. 28:13. In Lk. 24:24 a confirmatory visit of disciples to the tomb was also provided.) One is left to wonder, however, why Jesus did not appear to the two disciples instead of to Mary.

20:11–18 The Appearance of Jesus to Mary. If this were the real continuation of v. 10, something ought to have been said about Mary's following the two disciples, or meeting them as they return. We actually are back in the general situation of v. 1 (cf. Lk. 24:1–4, except that Jn. has only the one woman). This suggests that the entire episode, vv. 2–10, represents secondary elaboration of the received story by the evangelist.

vv. 11–13 Mary stands at the open tomb weeping. Peering into it, she sees two angels (Lk. 24:4) clad in white (Mk. 16: 5), who ask her why she is weeping. Apparently without any fright (cf. Mk. 16:5) she answers plaintively that they have taken away her Lord and that she does not know where they have put him. One would expect the angels to say something—at least as much as in Lk. 24:5–7. Their mention does not advance the action, and is made superfluous by what follows, viz., the lovely scene of the risen Jesus and Mary. One may assume that vv. 12–13 with the connecting link of v. 14a were also added to the received story by the Gospel author.

vv. 14–18 [Saying these things,] she turned backward and saw Jesus, but did not recognize him. He said to her, "Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?" Thinking that he was the gardener, she said to him, "Sir (12:21), if thou hast removed him (from the tomb) tell me where thou has laid him and I will take him (away)." She speaks naïvely without considering her strength or where to go with the body. Jesus then calls her by name, "Mary." Turning (again, after having looked away to the tomb) she said "Rabbunéi" (*Rabbūnī,* now vindicated by the Galilean Aramaic Targum, *Neofiti* I) which the evangelist explains means "Teacher" (more precisely "my Lord"; cf. Mk. 10:51). Mary apparently tries to touch him. Jesus rejects this, saying, "Do not touch me." (The narrative is correcting the tradition reported in Mt. 28:9: "They took hold of his feet," implying that that is what they—here she—wanted to do, but that Jesus forbade it.) The continuation, giving the reason for the command, is strange: "For I have not yet ascended to the Father." The presupposition is that he is ascending to the Father *immediately*. The point is not that touching him would detain him, but rather that it is improper, because his first reunion must be with the Father. (There certainly can be no "touching" him after he has ascended.) He gives her the command to go to his "brethren" (the disciples; cf. v. 18; Mt. 28:10) and tell them that he (now) is ascending to his Father and their Father, to his God and their God. (The message is changed from its earlier form, as given by an angel, Mk. 16:7, Mt. 28:10, to suit Johannine ideas.) Whether Jesus then disappeared is not related. Mary takes to the disciples the message that she has seen the Lord and that he said these things to her.

Since vv. 2–10, 12–14a, as mentioned above are expansions, the story originally told only of Mary's coming to the tomb, of Christ's appearance to her, and of his message. If one reads it as representing a tradition in which this was the *sole* appearance of Christ to a human being after his resurrection, it becomes fully clear. The "other Mary" of Mt. 28:1–9 having dropped out, Mary Magdalene alone in that tradition had fallen heir to the privilege of seeing the Lord. The message to the disciples of a prospective appearance to them (Mk. 16:7) has been converted to one of his departure to the Father. This account displays but little interest in the proof of the actuality of Christ's resurrection. (Not even two women witnesses are allowed.) It is basically Hellenistic with its woman-interest and sentimental vein. With its immediate departure of Christ to heaven, it would in its original form have made a most appropriate conclusion for this Gospel, in which the thought that Christ would be glorified by being "lifted up" is viewed as a single process including both crucifixion and ascension. However, the strongly established older tradition, giving weight to angels and Apostles, had to be taken into account, especially if the Gospel was to come into public use, and so the evangelist expanded this incident, as indicated above, but without damaging its original substance. He then added further stories about appearances of Christ to the Apostles, unmindful of the fact that they were basically inconsistent with this one.

20:19–23 The Appearance of Jesus to the Twelve (Mk. 16:7; Mt. 28:16 f.; Lk. 24:36–49). The appearance to the Twelve was of cardinal importance (1 Cor. 15:5). John, like Luke, puts it in the Jerusalem scene. It took place when it was evening on that first day of the Sabbaths (= the week), and the doors were locked "where the disciples were" because of fear of the Jews. (This hour is probably chosen in view of Christian Sunday-evening services; cf. Acts 20:7–8; the place the story has in mind is the Christian meeting house in Jerusalem, Acts 1:13; cf. Acts 12:12 f.) The locked doors were no obstacle for the heavenly Christ. (Cf. the similar entry of a divinity in Homer's *Odyssey, 6,* 15 f.) He stood in the midst (Mk. 3:3), gave the "peace" greeting (cf. vv. 21, 26; in some manuscripts, in Lk. 24:36), and showed them his hands and his side (originally "his feet," cf. Lk. 24:39? If so, changed to conform to 19:34). There is no mention of doubt or fear on the part of the disciples, as in Luke; when they saw the Lord they rejoiced (cf. the mixed description, Lk. 24:41). Then he again spoke a peace greeting (cf. the fact that Luke's version is also in two parts, Lk. 24:36–43 and 44–49), and declared that as the Father sent him, so he is sending them (this is an echo of the missionary command, Mt. 28:18 f., Mk. 16:14 f., but with the foreign mission idea not mentioned). Saying this, he blew his breath (at them) and told them to receive (therewith) the Holy Spirit (cf. the twofold meaning of Gr. *pneuma,* "wind" and "spirit," in 3:8). This, therefore, is the Johannine equivalent to Luke's sending of the Spirit at Pentecost. But instead of the Spirit's filling them with enthusiasm for mighty deeds, they receive eccelesiastical powers! If they forgive the sins of certain ones, they will be forgiven them (by God); if they hold them (unforgiven), they will be so held (by God). (Cf. Mt. 18:18; in Mt. 16:18, the authority is conferred exclusively on Peter.)

The story is clearly related to the one in Lk. 24:36–49, though the doubt element of the latter has been omitted, in view of the purpose of exploiting it separately in vv. 26 f., and Jesus' eating and drinking are also left out. It is not clear whether the author thought of Jesus as already elevated to the Father (20:17) and reappearing for this occasion. He also has not harmonized this conveying of the Spirit with the prophecy of the paraclete (14:16, 16: 7, 13). It seems likely that the story was originally a self-contained incident: the report of the appearance of Christ to his disciples, conceived of as his only appearance.

20:24–29 The Appearance for the Sake of Thomas. There is no warrant in Lk. 24:36–49 for a second appearance to the Twelve. The scene is thus merely a duplication of the one in vv. 19–23, with exploitation of the unused possibilities of v. 20 (cf. Lk. 24:39). The simple device of declaring one disciple to have been absent at the occasion of vv. 19–23 made possible this addition. The choice of Thomas as the one was probably due to his popularity in the area where this Gospel originated. The Apostle has been mentioned twice (11:16, 14:5), whereas in the Synoptics he occurs only in the name lists. It is very probable that legends about him, such as later found a repository in the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas, were already in existence at this time, and one of these may have told of an appearance of the Lord to him.

Thomas is portrayed as unwilling to believe the declaration of the others that they had seen the Lord. If he cannot see in Jesus' hand the imprint of the nails and put his finger into the place where the nails were, and put his hand in his side (19:34), he will not believe. (No mention was made of nails in the crucifixion story. The allusion to them here has given rise to the idea that Jesus was nailed to the cross. This, however, is improbable, for the custom was to tie the hands of the prisoner to the *patibulum* or crossbar. Nails were used to inflict torture, however. It may be that the words attributed to Thomas were formulated under the influence of Scripture prophecy taken as containing exact prediction of the life of Christ. In the Messianically interpreted Ps. 22:16, the Messiah says, "They have pierced my hands and my feet." In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, the Jews draw the nails from the hands of the dead Lord and lay his body on the ground. It is not clear that this meant that he was nailed to the cross.)

Eight days later (i.e., the following Sunday, no doubt again in the evening), Jesus appears in the same locked house to the assembled group, with Thomas present. He addresses the peace greeting to all, but then concerns himself only with Thomas, omnisciently aware of what the latter had said. He invites him to touch his wounds and believe. Thomas apparently refrains from accepting this invitation. Overwhelmed, he responds with, "My Lord and my God!" It thus remained for him to utter the crowning confession, for which 1:1 prepared the way with the assertion: The Logos was God. It is noteworthy that the Emperor Domitian, in whose time this Gospel probably was written, also received the titles, "Our lord and god." Christians could not do less than give these predicates to Jesus, king of a different realm (18:36). Thomas' reply elicits from Jesus a Beatitude (cf. 13:17) on those who believe without seeing. (Cf. the beloved disciple in 20:8, and all future believers. This is no devaluation of the resurrection appearances, but rather a closing of the door to any further ones.) Therewith the account of this incident, too, breaks off abruptly.

The story leaves Thomas without having received the Holy Spirit, but it seems doubtful that any downgrading of him is intended. The omission merely proves that Thomas was originally imagined as present in 20:19–23, and that this story is of separate origin. Its apologetic value was great. Here was a disciple who had refused to believe. But the Lord in his great love and mercy had convinced him of the reality of the resurrection. The physical touching, in sharp contrast to 20:17, was of particular importance over against Docetism (cf. p. 268).

20:30–31 The Original Conclusion of the Gospel. What we read here is definitely a *finis,* and necessitates the assumption that ch. 21 is an appendix. The author sets down the nature and purpose of his work —hence closes in a more literary vein than the other evangelists. He states that Jesus did many other signs which are not written in this book, but that these things have been recorded that his readers might believe that Jesus "is the Christ, the Son of God" (cf. 1:49, the Son of God, the king of Israel) and have (eternal) life (3:15) in his name (= him, 1:12; 3:18). It is noteworthy, then, that the author thinks of his work as primarily containing an account of the signs done by Jesus. This may have been written for the book in an earlier stage of its existence, before it was enriched with discourses and the Passion narrative. In any case it stresses what Jesus did rather than what he said or what was done to him. His signs were the thing that revealed his glory (2:10; cf. 1:14, 31).

An Additional Narrative
21:1–25

A new narrative is appended after the conclusion just reached. Whether this addition was made by a different hand or by the author himself is a moot question. One can be sure only that vv. 24–25 were editorial.

21:1–14 The Appearance of Jesus at the Sea of Tiberias. The story comes from a different traditional source than those related by the Gospel author in ch. 20. It presupposes that the disciples left Jerusalem without having seen the Lord, thus disagreeing with 20:19–23, but agreeing with Mk. 16:7 and Mt. 28:16 f. It seems probable that in the tradition from which it was derived, it was the sole appearance of Jesus to the disciples (like Mt. 28:16 f.). It shows kinship with the version of the Easter events in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter. According to that work, the disciples left Jerusalem on the last day of the Unleavened Bread festival (which would have been the Thursday after Easter). Each one returned to his house, grieved over what had happened (i.e., the crucifixion of Jesus). The story continues:

> But I Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother took our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us Levi the son of Alpheus, whom the Lord . . . .

Therewith the preserved part of the Gospel breaks off, but it seems clear that what was then related is the same fishing expedition of which we have a report in this last chapter of John. The introductory verses of the story of the Gospel of Peter supply the information one sorely misses at the beginning of Jn. 21.

vv. **1–2** A simple introductory statement relates that after this, Jesus manifested himself again to his disciples at the sea of Tiberias (6:1). He manifested himself thus. There were together a number of disciples—but not the whole group of the Eleven. Only five are identified—Peter, Thomas, again with allusion to his Greek name, Nathanael, who here is described as from Cana, and "the ones of Zebedee" (without their personal names; considered by many to have been secondarily added); besides these there were "two other disciples." If in the subsequent narrative the beloved disciple of 13:23 appears, he may in the intention of the narrator be a son of Zebedee or one of these unidentified ones. However, it seems highly probable that the beloved disciple has been introduced into the story in the course of its expansion (cf. below).

vv. 3–6 Simon Peter said to the others, "I go to fish," and they replied that they were coming with him. They went forth and got into the boat, and in that night caught nothing. When it was already becoming dawn, Jesus stood at the shore and the disciples did not know it was he. He said to them, "Children, have you 'anything additional' to eat?" (The word used is Gr. *prospházion*. This is the only passage in all Greek literature where it is found, its synonym *prosópsēma* being used elsewhere. The main dish of the ancients was bread; meat or fish was considered an extra, to be eaten with it, if and when available.) On receiving a negative reply, Jesus bade them cast out the net once more on the right side of the boat. They did so, and could not haul it in owing to the great number of fish.

v. 7 According to the present text, the disciple whom Jesus loved now said to Peter, "It is the Lord," thus revealing his quicker insight (20:8). Peter, who was "naked" (i.e., just wearing his tunic; cf. Mk. 14:51), girded on his outer tunic (Gr. *ependýtēs;* to appear before the Lord respectably clad) and cast himself into the sea (cf. Mt. 14:29). This verse causes confusion in the story, for Peter's action remains pointless. Furthermore, in view of v. 12b, the beloved disciple's remark is superfluous. The author has evidently added this element to the received story to show again, as in 20:4 f., how the beloved disciple was superior to Peter in insight.

v. 8 The other disciples, unable to pull in the net, dragged it and made for shore in the boat. The evangelist notes, as though to convey the impression of realistic reporting, that they were only two hundred cubits away from it. When they went out on land (unconcerned about their netful of fish?) they saw a coal fire (18:18) laid, and fish (collective sing.) were lying on it, and (there was) bread. Jesus bade them bring some of the freshly caught fish. Peter went up (out of the water? into the boat?) and (singlehandedly) hauled in the net with 153 big fish, and though there were so many, the net (miraculously) was not rent. In view of the Johannine tendency toward symbolism, we may assume that it portrays Peter as the one who brings in the most converts (the "net that was not rent" being the Church). The exact figure of 153 fish must then also have had some significance for the writer. Here there are many possibilities, all necessarily speculative. One of the most attractive is suggested by the report of St. Jerome that an ancient zoologist gave 153 as the total number of the fishes known to science in those days; if this be so, the number could be symbolical of the Church's gathering in of people of every language or nationality.

vv. 12–14 Jesus now invited them with the words, "Come and have breakfast." (The instruction to bring some of the fish, v. 10, is lost sight of, and there is no time to cook them, since the action proceeds.) None of the disciples dared ask him who he was—they knew it was the Lord. The atmosphere is thus ghostlike, while the person and actions are concrete. Jesus comes and takes the bread, and gives it to them; likewise, the fish (cf. 6:11). A cultic meal of the Galilean Christians is here projected into an Easter setting—perhaps a dawn communion breakfast at the shore of the lake of Galilee. (Cf. such a one on the shore of the Black Sea in the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew.) The evangelist seemingly breaks off the narrative (cf. 2:11) with the concluding remark that this was the third time Jesus appeared to the disciples after his resurrection. (The statement thus reverts back to 21:1.) The appearance to Mary is not counted, perhaps because the original tradition knew nothing of it.

The story (vv. 1–14) is composed of various elements that have been fused together. If the rest of the Gospel of Peter is ever recovered, we may get a clearer picture of its evolution. Much of the confusion is relieved if one recognizes: (1) that the author added v. 7 (the beloved disciple's words to Peter and the latter's jumping into the Sea); (2) that a line of thought in which a meal was prepared from newly caught fish and one in which an already prepared meal was distributed by Jesus have been combined. The author naturally had to make minor adjustments, such as adding the "other" (disciples) in v. 8. The most obscure feature now is the relation of their "going out of" the boat and Peter's "going up" to pull in the net. But still another critical insight is necessary: the element about the great catch of v. 10 is related to Lk. 5:1–11. That story has been fused with the seaside-appearance story. It seems likely that John has dropped verses equivalent to Lk. 5:8–10 in which Peter declared his sinfulness but was made a fisher of men. By adding 21:15 f. John made good the omission.

21:15–23 The Rehabilitation of Peter; His Fate and That of the Beloved Disciple. With the brief link, "when they had eaten breakfast," the narrator establishes a transition to this moving and impressive final piece.

Jesus asks Peter: "Simon (son) of John (A.V.: Jonas, based on Mt. 16:17; use of the full name makes this particularly solemn), dost thou love me more than these (others)?" Peter does not assert such superiority (contrast Mk. 14:29, softened in Jn. 13:37), but declares, "Yea Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." He then is told to feed Christ's little lambs (Gr. *arnía*). Question, answer, and instruction are then repeated; in the instruction different words are used: "shepherd my lambs" (Gr. *probátia*). When the question is repeated a third time, Simon is grieved and says: "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee." Again he is told to feed Christ's lambs (some texts have Gr. *próbata:* sheep). That this threefold interrogation and instruction bears a relation to Peter's threefold denial (13:38) does not need to be explained by the evangelist; every reader sees it at once. The author's objective is to rehabilitate Peter, but more than that: it is to confer on him the authority of being the shepherd of Christ's flock. "Shepherd" was an old figure for "ruler," and in effect this is a conferring on Peter of the primacy in the leadership of the Church (a parallel then to Mt. 16:18–19).

But Jesus adds an Amen-saying giving solemn prophecy. He tells Peter that when he was younger he girded himself and walked about where he wished, but that when he becomes old he will stretch forth his hands and another (some mss.: others) will gird him and lead him whither he does not wish to go. The evangelist adds that Jesus said this to indicate by what manner of death he was to "glorify" God (cf. 1 Pt. 4:16). It is obvious that when this was written Peter had suffered martyrdom. (Whether stretching out of the hands refers to his being bound or even to his receiving of the crossbar, is uncertain; the saying may just be employing the figure of a doddering old man.) Jesus then said, "Follow me" (evidently meant symbolically with the deeper meaning of "in martyrdom," cf. 13:36; hardly just to take him aside and speak with him in private). Peter, turning, sees the beloved disciple (about whom the evangelist recapitulates, 13:23) following, and asks Jesus concerning this one's destiny. Jesus both rejects and answers the question: "If it is my will that he remain until I come, what business of thine is that?" In other words, this disciple may still be alive at the Second Coming of Jesus. Peter is brought back to his own task with another, "Do thou follow me."

It is not impossible that vv. 15–19 are derived from a story of the appearance of Christ to Peter, and that the beloved disciple has been added secondarily by the Gospel author in vv. 20 f. For this author has a special interest in bringing forward the mysterious figure that first appeared on the scene in 13:23. His intention may have been to justify this disciple's leadership in the Church after the martyrdom of Peter, while conceding primacy to the latter during his lifetime.

v. 23 The author now seeks to correct a supposed misunderstanding of this saying of Jesus that existed among "the brethren," namely, that the beloved disciple would not die, but would live to see Christ's return. He insists that what Jesus had said was stated only as a possibility. If one recalls, however, how vivid the expectation of the imminent return of Jesus was among the early Christians (as reflected, e.g., in 1–2 Thessalonians), then one will realize that such an idea could well be entertained. As a matter of fact, a word of Jesus reported in the Synoptic tradition (cf. Mk. 9:1) has here been narrowed down to apply to only one person—a development analogous to the reduction of the doubters of Mt. 28:17 to the single one of Jn. 20:24 f.

The Johannine resurrection stories stand at the end of the development. It is amazing to see how the rich knowledge revealed by Paul in 1 Cor. 15:4–8 has faded out into a few legends, some with an extremely materialistic view of the resurrection body.

21:24–25 The Editor's Concluding Testimony. The conclusion of the chapter identifies the beloved disciple as the one who testifies to these things and wrote the book (cf. 19:35). The statement "we know that his witness is true" suggests that others are putting their seal of approval under it, though the plural "we" could stand for a singular, and mean an editor. The idea of the original conclusion (20:30) that Jesus did a great deal more than is related in this Gospel is repeated. The editor then asserts that if everything Jesus had done were to be recorded *seriatim*, the world could not contain the books that would have to be written. This statement is not found in Codex S, but may have been omitted only because it seemed exaggerated. Origen resorts to an untenable reinterpretation of the word "contain," taking it to mean that the world could not "understand" the books, etc. But the exaggeration is not without parallel. Thus a rabbi who lived in the time of the Apostles is reported to have said: "If all the heavens were parchments, and all the trees pens, and all the seas ink, it would not suffice to record all the wisdom I learned from my teacher. . . ." The biblical writer makes his statement with much greater justification. It is a dogma to him that the acts of Christ must be inexhaustible. For how could that which the Son of God did ever be measured or contained?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. General (except Commentaries)

Aalen, S. D., *Die Begriffe Licht und Finsternis im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Rabbinismus,* 1951.

Aaland, K. *et al., The Gospels Reconsidered,* 1960.

Albertz, M., *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments,* vol. I, pts. 1 and 2, 1947, 1952.

———, *Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche,* 1921.

Bacon, B. W., *The Gospel of Mark,* 1925.

———, *Studies in Matthew,* 1930.

———, *The Gospel of the Hellenists,* edited by Carl H. Kraeling, 1933.

Barrett, C. K., *The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition,* 1947.

———, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents,* 1957.

Barr, A., *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships,* 1949.

Bauer, W., *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum,* 1934.

Baumbach, G., *Qumran und das Johannesevangelium,* 1957.

Beare, F. W., *The Earliest Records of Jesus. A Companion to Huck's Synopsis of the First Three Gospels,* 1961.

Becker, H., *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede;* herausgegeben von R. Bultmann, 1956.

Bertram, G., *Die Leidensgeschichte und der Christuskult,* 1922.

Bieler, L., *Theios Aner. Das Bild des göttlichen Menschen in Spätantike und Frühchristentum,* 2 vols., 1935–36.

Black, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts,* 2d ed., 1954.

Blinzler, J., *Der Prozess Jesu,* 2d ed., 1955.

Bonsirven, J., *Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jesus-Christ,* 2 vols., 1934, 1935.

Bornkamm, G., *Jesus of Nazareth* (tr.), 1960; German original 1956.

———, Barth, G., and Held, H. J., *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium,* 1960.

Bousset, W., *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter,* 3d ed. by H. Gressmann, 1926.

———, *Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des Christusglaubens,* 2d ed., 1921.

Bowman, J. W., *The Intention of Jesus,* 1945.

Büchsel, F., *Die Hauptfragen der Synoptikerkritik,* 1939.

———, *Johannes und der Hellenistische Synkretismus,* 1928.

Bultmann, R., *History of the Synoptic Tradition,* 1960 (tr. of the 1957 German edition, 1st ed., 1921).

———, *The Theology of the New Testament* (tr.), 2 vols., 1960.

———, *Offenbarung und Heilsgeschehen,* 1941. (Entmythologisirung.)

Bundy, W. E., *Jesus and the First Three Gospels,* 1955.

Burney, C. F., *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel,* 1922.

Burrows, M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls,* 1956.

———, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 1958.

Bussmann, W., *Synoptische Studien,* 3 vols., 1925–31.

Cadbury, H. J., *The Making of Luke-Acts,* 1927.

Cadoux, C. J., *The Historic Mission of Jesus,* 1941.

Charles, R. H., ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* 2 vols., 1913.

Colwell, E. C., *An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus,* 1947.

———, and Titus, E. L., *The Gospel of the Spirit,* 1938.

Conzelmann, H., *The Theology of St. Luke,* 1960 (tr. of his *Die Mitte der Zeit,* 1954; 2d ed., 1957).

Cross, F. L., ed., *Studies in the Fourth Gospel,* 1957.

Cross, F. M. Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran,* 1958.

Cullmann, O., *Christologie des Neuen Testaments,* 2d ed., 1958.

———, *Les Sacrements dans l'évangile Johannique,* 1957.

———, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (tr.), 1953.

Dalman, G., *The Words of Jesus* (tr.), 1902.

———, *Jesus Jeshua* (tr.), 1929.

Davies, W D., and Daube, D., ed., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology,* 1956.

Deissmann, A., *Bible Studies* (tr.), 1919.

Dibelius, M., *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919), 3d ed. by G. Bornkamm, with "Nachtrag" by G. Iber, 1959.

———, *From Tradition to Gospel* (tr. of the second edition of the above), 1935.

———, *Botschaft und Geschichte,* ed. G. Bornkamm, vol. I, 1953.

———, *Gospel Criticism and Christology,* 1935.

———, *The Message of Jesus Christ* (tr. by F. C. Grant), 1939.

Dibelius, M., *The Sermon on the Mount,* 1940.

Dodd, C. H., *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development,* 1936.

———, *Parables of the Kingdom,* 3d ed., 1936.

———, *New Testament Studies,* 1953.

———, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel,* 1953.

Duncan, G. S., *The Son of Man,* 1947.

Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (tr.), 1962.

Easton, B. S., *The Gospel before the Gospel,* 1928.

———, *Christ in the Gospels,* 1930.

Ebeling, H. J., *Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Markusevangelisten,* 1939.

Eusebius, *The Church History,* tr. by Lake, K., and Oulton, J. E. C. (Loeb Classical Library), 2 vols., 1927–28.

Feine, Paul, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* 9th ed. by J. Behm, 1950.

Fiebig, P., *Der Erzählungsstil der Evangelien,* 1925.

Filson, F. V., *Which Books Belong in the Bible? A Study of the Canon,* 1957.

Fuller, R. H., *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus,* 1957.

Gardner, P., *The Ephesian Gospel,* 1916.

Gardner-Smith, P., *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels,* 1938.

Goodspeed, E. J., *Introduction to the New Testament,* 1937.

Goppelt, L., *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert,* 1954.

Grant, F. C., *The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth,* 1957. Replaces *The Growth of the Gospels,* 1933.

———, *The Earliest Gospel,* 1943.

———, *The Gospel of the Kingdom,* 1940.

———, *Form Criticism. A New Method in New Testament Research,* 1934.

———, *Introduction to New Testament Thought,* 1957.

———, *Ancient Judaism and the New Testament,* 1960.

———, *Translating the Bible,* 1961.

Grant, R. M., *The Bible in the Church,* Rev. ed., 1954.

———, *Second Century Christianity. A Collection of Fragments,* 1946.

Grant, R. M., and Freedman, D. N., *Secret Sayings of Jesus,* 1960. (Gospel of Thomas.)

Grass, H., *Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte,* 1956.

Grässer, E., *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den Evangelien und der Apostelgeschichte,* 1957.

Gregory, C. R., *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments,* 2 vols., 1900, 1902.

———, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* 1909 (for the text).

Grobel, K., *Formgeschichte und Synoptische Quellenanalyse,* 1937.

———, *The Gospel of Truth,* 1960. (Coptic Apocryphal.)

Haenchen, E., *Die Botschaft des Thomasevangeliums,* 1961.

Harnack, A. von, *The Origin of the New Testament* (tr.), 1925.

———, *Luke the Physician* (tr.), 1907.

———, *Sayings of Jesus* (tr.), 1908.

Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae,* 2d ed., 1909.

Helmbold, H., *Vorsynoptische Evangelien,* 1953.

Hennecke, E., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen,* 3d ed. by W. Schneemelcher, vol. I, *Die Evangelien,* 1959.

Hoare, R. F., *Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel,* 1944.

Howard, W. F., *Christianity according to St. John,* 1943.

———, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation,* new ed., 1955.

———, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship,* 1949.

Hoskyns, E. C., and Davey, F. N., *The Fourth Gospel,* 2 vols., 1940.

———, *The Riddle of the New Testament,* 3d ed., 1947.

Hirsch, E., *Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums,* 2 vols., 1941, 1951.

———, *Studien zum vierten Evangelium,* 1936.

Holtzmann, H. J., *Die synoptischen Evangelien,* 1863.

Huck, A., *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels,* Engl. ed. by F. L. Cross, 1951 (Greek text. This is the 9th German edition, edited by H. Lietzmann and H. G. Opitz, 1936. It was inferior, however, to the last editions prepared by Huck himself, the eighth being of 1934. For Huck with English text see under Throckmorton).

Hunt, B. P. W. Stather, *Primitive Gospel Sources,* 1951.

James, M. R., *The Apocryphal New Testament,* 1924.

Jaubert, A., *La Date de la Cène,* 1957.

Jeremias, J., *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (tr.), 1952.

———, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu,* 2d ed., 1958.

———, *The Parables of Jesus* (tr.), 1954.

———, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus* (tr.), 1958.

Josephus, Flavius. Text and translation by H. St. John Thackeray and R. Marcus (Loeb Classical Library); see also Whiston.

Jülicher, A., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* ed. Fascher, E., 7th ed., 1931.

Kee, H. C., and Young, F. W., *The Living World of the New Testament,* 1960.

Kenyon, F., *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* revised by A. W. Adams, 1958.

———, *The Text of the Greek Bible,* 1949.

Kilpatrick, G. D., *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew,* 1946.

Kittel, G., ed., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* 1933 ff.

———, *Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Christentum,* 1921.

Klausner, J., *Jesus of Nazareth,* 1926.

Knopf, R., *Einführung in das Neue Testament;* ed. by H. Lietzmann and H. Weinel, 1949.

Knox, J., *The Death of Jesus,* 1958.

Knox, W. L., *Sources of the Synoptic Gospels,* 2 vols., 1953, 1957.

Koch, G., *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi,* 1959.

Kraeling, C. H., *Anthropos and Son of Man,* 1927.

———, *John the Baptist,* 1951.

———, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura,* 1935.

Kraeling, E. G., *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri,* 1953.

———, *Rand McNally Bible Atlas,* 1956.

———, *Rand McNally Historical Atlas of the Holy Land,* 1960.

Kümmel, W. G., *Das Neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme,* 1958.

———, *Promise and Fulfilment. The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (tr.), 1959.

Kundsin, K., *Charakter und Ursprung der Johanneischen Reden,* 1939.

Lagrange, M., *Histoire ancienne du Canon du Nouveau Testament,* 1933.

Lake, K., *Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies,* 1902.

Lake, K. and S., *An Introduction to the New Testament,* 1937.

Larfeld, W., *Die Neutestamentlichen Evangelien nach ihrer Eigenart und Abhängigkeit,* 1925.

Lightfoot, R. H., *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels,* 1937.

———, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels,* 1935.

———, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark,* 1950.

Lindsay, A. D., *The Moral Teaching of Jesus,* 1937.

Lofthouse, W., *The Disciple Whom Jesus Loved,* 1936.

Major, H. D. A., Manson, T. W., Wright, C. J., *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* 1937.

Manson, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus,* 1931.

———, *Jesus the Messiah,* 1943.

———, *The Sayings of Jesus,* 1949. Reprinted from Major,

Manson, T. W., *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles,* 1960.

Marxsen, W., *Der Evangelist Markus,* 1956.

———, *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie,* 1960.

McCasland, S. V., *The Resurrection of Jesus,* 1932.

McCown, C. C., *The Search for the Real Jesus,* 1940.

McGinley, L. J., *Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives,* 1944.

McNeile, A. H., *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament,* 2d ed. rev. by C. S. C. Williams, 1953.

Meyer, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums,* vol. I, *Die Evangelien,* 1921, vol. II, *Die Entwicklung des Judentums, und Jesus von Nazaret,* 1925.

Metzger, B. M., *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament,* 1955.

Michaelis, W., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* 2d ed., 1954.

———, *Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium,* 1946.

Moffatt, J., *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament,* 2d ed., 1918.

Moore, G. F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,* 2 vols., 1950; vol. 3, notes.

Morgenthaler, K., *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung,* 1949.

Nestle, Eberhard, *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament.* 4th ed., revised by E. von Dobschütz, 1923.

Nineham, D. E., ed., *Studies in the Gospels,* 1955.

Odeberg, H., *The Fourth Gospel,* 1929.

Olmstead, A. T., *Jesus in the Light of History,* 1942.

Otto, R., *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn,* 1934.

Percy, E., *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der Johanneischen Theologie,* 1939.

Pribnow, H., *Die Johanneische Anschauung vom Leben,* 1934.

Price, J. B., *Interpreting the New Testament,* 1961.

Rawlinson, H. E. J., *Christ in the Gospels,* 1944.

Redlich, E. B., *The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels,* 1936.

———, *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel,* 1916.

———, *Form Criticism, Its Value and Limitations,* 1939, 2d ed., 1948.

Rehkopf, F., *Die Lukanische Sonderquelle,* 1959.

Richardson, A., *The Gospels in the Making,* 1938.

Richardson, A., *The Miracle Stories of the Gospels,* 1941.

Riddle, D. W., *The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth,* 1939.

Reitzenstein, R., *Das Mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung,* 1919.

———, *Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium,* 1921.

———, and Schaeder, H. H., *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus,* 1926.

Riesenfeld, H., *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study of the Limits of Formgeschichte,* 1957.

———, *Jésus Transfigurée,* 1947.

Roberts, C. H., *Unpublished Fragments of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library,* 1935.

Robinson, J. M., *Geschichtsverständnis des Markusevangelisten,* 1956.

———, *The Problem of History in Mark,* 1957.

———, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus,* 1959.

Ropes, J. H., *The Synoptic Gospels,* 1934.

Ruckstuhl, E., *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums,* 1951.

Sahlin, H., *Studien zu Kapitel 3 des Lukasevangeliums,* 1949.

———, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie,* 1945.

Sanday, W., ed., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem,* 1911.

Sanders, J. N., *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church,* 1943.

Schick, E., *Formgeschichte und Synoptische Exegese,* 1940.

Schelkle, K. H., *Die Passion Jesu,* 1949.

Schmidt, K. L., *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu,* 1919.

Schmid, L., *Johannes und die Religionsgeschichte,* 1933.

Schneider, J., *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus in der Neutestamentlichen Forschung der Gegenwart,* 1958.

Schulz, S., *Komposition und Herkunft der Johanneischen Reden,* 1960.

———, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohnchristologie im Johannesevangelium,* 1957.

Schürer, E., *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,* 3d and 4th ed., 1901–1908.

Schwartz, E., *Der Tod der Söhne Zebedäi,* 1904; see his *Gesammelte Schriften,* vol. V.

Schweitzer, A., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (tr.), 1926.

Schweizer, E., *Ego eimi. Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft der Johanneischen Bildreden,* 1939.

Scott, E. F., *The Literature of the New Testament,* 1932.

———, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Its Theology,* 2d ed., 1908.

Sparks, H. F. D., *The Formation of the New Testament,* 1952.

Stauffer, E., *Jesus and His Story* (tr.), 1960.

Stendahl, K., *The School of St. Matthew,* 1954.

———, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament,* 1958.

Strachan, R. H., *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment,* 1941.

Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels,* 1924 (8th ed., 1953).

Taylor, V., *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition,* 1933; 2d ed., 1935.

———, *The Gospels: A Short Introduction.* 8th ed., 1956.

Thomas, J., *Le mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et en Syrie* (150 B.C.–A.D. 300), 1935.

Throckmorton, B., *Gospel Parallels: A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels following Huck-Lietzmann and Using the Revised Standard Version,* 1949.

———, *The New Testament and Mythology,* 1960.

Tödt, H. E., *Der Menschensohn in der Synoptischen Überlieferung,* 1959.

Torrey, C. C., *The Four Gospels* (tr. with notes), 1933.

———, *Our Translated Gospels,* 1936.

Turner, H. E. W., *Behind the Third Gospel,* 1926.

———, *Formation of the Gospel Tradition,* 2d ed., 1953.

———, *Jesus, Master and Lord: A Study in the Historical Truth of the Gospels,* 1953.

Vaganay, L., *Le Problème Synoptique,* 1954.

Volz, P., *Die Eschatologie der Jüdischen Gemeinde in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter,* 2d ed., 1934.

Weiss, B., *Die Quellen der Synoptischen Überlieferung,* 1908.

———, *Die vier Evangelien im berichtigten Text,* 1900.

Weiss, J., *Das älteste Evangelium,* 1903.

———, *Jesu Predigt vom Reich Gottes,* 1892.

———, *History of Primitive Christianity* (tr. by F. C. Grant), 2 vols., 1937.

Wellhausen, J., *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien,* 1905.

———, *Erweiterungen im Johannesevangelium,* 1907.

Wendland, P., *Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen,* 2d and 3d ed., 1912.

Werner, M., *Der Einfluss der Paulinischen Theologie im Markusevangelium,* 1923.

Wernle, P., *Die Synoptische Frage,* 1899.

Whiston, W., *The Works of Flavius Josephus,* newly edited by D. S. Margoliouth, 1906.

Wilder, A. M., *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus,* 2d ed., 1950.

Wiles, M. F., *The Spiritual Gospel. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church,* 1959.

Wilkens, W., *Die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums,* 1958.

Windisch, H., *Johannes und die Synoptiker,* 1926.

Wrede, W., *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien,* 1901.

Zahn, T., *Introduction to the New Testament* (tr.), 3 vols., 2d ed., 1917.

———, *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons,* 2d ed., 1904.

B. Some Commentaries on the Gospels

The Interpreter's Bible, vols. VII–VIII, 1951–54. Johnson, S. (Matthew); Grant, F. C. (Mark); Gilmour, S. M. (Luke); Howard, W. F. (John).

Revised Standard Version Bible Commentary ed. Grant, F. C., Vol. 6, *The Gospels and Acts,* by Grant, F. C., 1962.

Harper's Annotated Bible Series, 1952 f. (The Gospels (except Luke) separately by F. C. Grant. The Authorized Version used as text.)

Torch Bible Commentaries. Cox, G. E. P. (Matthew, 1952); Hunter, A. M. (Mark, 1951); Browning, W. R. F. (Luke, 1960); Richardson, A. (John, 1959).

Black's New Testament Commentaries. Filson, F. V. (Matthew, 1960); Johnson, S. (Mark, 1960); Leaney, A. R. C. (Luke, 1958); Sanders, J. N. (John, 1943).

Moffatt New Testament Commentaries. Robinson, T. H. (Matthew, 1928); Branscomb, B. H. (Mark, 1937); Manson, T. W. (Luke, 1930); Macgregor, G. H. C. (John, 1928).

International Critical Commentary. Allen, W. C. (Matthew, 1907); Gould, E. P. (Mark, 1896); Plummer, A. (Luke, 1896); Bernard, J. H. (John, 1929). This series is only for those able to use ancient languages.

German (non-technical) series:

Das Neue Testament Deutsch; 3 vols., 1932–35. Schniewind, J. (Matthew and Mark). Rengstorf, K. H. (Luke); Strathmann, H. (John). Can be had separately. More "theologically" oriented than its predecessor, the next work.

Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 4 vols., 3 ed., 1917. (Synoptics by Weiss, J. and Bousset, W.; Heitmüller, W., John.)

German Technical Commentaries:

Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. H. Lietzmann, 1911–30. The Synoptics by Klostermann, E.; Bauer, W., John. New editions of the individual commentaries have appeared.

Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Zahn, Th.; Zahn, Th., (Matthew, 4 ed. 1922); Wohlenberg, G. (Mark, 3 ed. 1930); Zahn, Th. (Luke, 3 ed. 1920); Zahn, Th. (John, 5 ed. 1921).

Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von H. A. W. Meyer. Lohmeyer, E. (Matthew, 1956; incomplete, posthumous; not a replacement for Weiss, B., 1910); Lohmeyer, E. (Mark, 1937); Weiss, B. (Luke, 1901); Bultmann, R. (John, rev. ed. 1950).

Wellhausen, J., *Das Evangelium Matthaei übersetzt und erklärt,* 1904. *Das Evangelium Marci übersetzt und erklärt,* 2 Ausgabe, 1909. *Das Evangelium Lucae übersetzt und erklärt,* 1904. *Das Evangelium Johannis,* 1908.

Schlatter, A., *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (1929); *Markus, der Evangelist der Griechen* (1935); *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (1931); *Der Evangelist Johannes* (1931). (Not to be confused with his inspirational commentaries in his *Erläuterungen*). These Commentaries are only profitable to the scholar, and chiefly for linguistic parallels from Josephus and Rabbinic sources.

Strack, H., and Billerbeck, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 5 vols., 1922–28; two supplementary index volumes have appeared, the first by Jeremias, J. to the Rabbinic sources. The work is a specialty commentary; it adduces Rabbinic materials where such happen to shed light.

French

Lagrange: (recent printings: Matthew, 1948; Mark, 1947; Luke, 1947; John, 1947.)

Loisy, A., *Les évangiles synoptiques,* 1907–08.

DATE DUE

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2341 .K89
The clarified New Testament.
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00012 6658

35352